SEMINARY OF THE EAST LIBRARY
3 0513 40022 2424

Return to: Harold McClure

Denver Seminary Washington DC Extension
c/o First Baptist Church of Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414

185

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/typologyofsciptu0001patr

THE

TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE,

OR

THE DOCTRINE OF TYPES

Investigated in its Principles,

AND

APPLIED TO THE EXPLANATION OF THE EARLIER REVELATIONS OF GOD, CONSIDERED AS PREPARATORY EXHIBITIONS OF THE LEADING TRUTHS OF THE GOSPEL.

BY

REV. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN,

SALTON.

TWO VOLUMES IN ONE.

VOL. I.

PATRIARCHAL PERIOD.

PHILADELPHIA:

DANIELS & SMITH, NO. 36 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

1852.

WM. S. YOUNG, PRINTER.

PREFACE.

In now presenting the following pages to the Public, the Author has nothing to add to what is stated in the Introduction, regarding their leading object, or the opening which at present exists for a work of this nature. It is intended to supply, what all, who have turned their attention seriously to the subject, must have felt to be a desideratum—to rescue the typology of Scripture, if possible, from the arbitrariness and uncertainty which have hitherto enveloped it, and to derive from it somewhat of real and substantial service toward the interpretation of the mind and purposes of God. How far he has succeeded in accomplishing this end, it is of course for others, not for himself, to decide.

It will be seen, on a slight inspection, that the second Part depends for the method of treatment pursued in it upon the first; and that the latter can be regarded as just and proper, only if the views and principles unfolded in the former are well understood and approved of. The one stands as the foundation, the other as the building raised on it. If this is overlooked, and the second Part is read and considered by itself, partial and erroneous judgments will naturally come to be formed. That all, who read what is here written, will go along with the Author in the views and principles he has endeavoured to establish in the first Part, or with every application he has made of them in the second, he is not so sanguine as to hope—considering, especially, how the line of inquiry he has pursued leads sometimes through what has hitherto received

but little consideration, and sometimes touches on points of difficulty, that have been involved in long and doubtful disputation. Differing, as he has frequently done, from so many others, and in some respects venturing to choose a path for himself in preference to any that has yet been trodden, it would ill become him to complain if some should dissent from the method he has adopted, and the conclusions at which he has arrived. He must say, however, for himself, that his great object has been to ascertain the truth, and to present, in some respects, both a better grounded, and a more complete and orderly exhibition of it, as connected with the earlier revelations of God, than he has been able elsewhere to find. In doing this, he has endeavoured to state his own views without arrogance, and his objections to the views of others so as not to cause needless offence.

In conducting the investigation pursued in the first Part, it was found unavoidable to use some measure of repetition, especially in the second and third chapters, in referring to the typical matter of Old Testament scripture. The necessity for this arose from the Author's anxiety to confine his examples and illustrations to such portions as had on their side the explicit authority of New Testament scripture, that no objection might lie against the inferences drawn from them, on the ground of a valid title not existing for their being accounted typical.—In the second Part, he has given to some topics what may seem at first sight an undue breadth of place, considering the position they held in respect merely to the revelations of the patriarchal age; in particular, to the cherubim, the hope of the inheritance, and the question respecting the restoration of the Jews. It was absolutely necessary, however, to enter into some consideration of these topics; and it seemed much better to go fully into the investigation of them, when they first appeared on the field of inquiry, than to treat them slightly now, and afterwards return to a more lengthened examination of them. Besides, the portion of Revelation, to which the particular application of the principles remains to be made, that, namely, which respects the dispensation of Moses, presents so wide and important a field of inquiry, that it was desirable to let no topic stand over for ex-

amination, which could with propriety be brought into the present volume. In regard to the last of the three topics mentioned above, the Author refers to the note on p. 321 for an explanation of the change his sentiments have undergone concerning it. His views there, however, need to be taken in connexion with what is written on the hope of the inheritance, to learn the extent of the change.

It may be proper to notice, that a reference has been made at p. 103 to Ps. xxiv. 6, which may seem hardly consistent with the brief explanation given of its meaning in the note to p. 301. In the first of these places the text is cited in proof of Christ's being called Jacob, and in that light it may still so far be regarded, notwithstanding the explanation given in the other place, as in him alone of all the seed of Jacob can the description of the Psalmist be said fully and perfectly to realize itself. It does not appear, however, although this does not in the least affect the substance of the representation given in the portion referred to, that Christ is ever directly and properly addressed by the name of Jacob; while he undoubtedly is, by the name of Israel.

The Author cannot allow this volume to go into the hands of the public without acknowledging the obligations under which he lies to the Rev. Dr. Watson, Edinburgh, who has kindly given himself the trouble of perusing the MS., and to whom the Author is indebted for much encouragement in the prosecution of his labours, and many valuable and important suggestions in the treatment of the different parts. Imperfect as the volume still is, it had been much more so, if the various portions had not, in their first shape, passed through the hands of one, who is equally distinguished for the correctness of his taste, the soundness of his judgment, and his extensive acquaintance with theological literature.

May the Lord be pleased to look with favour upon this effort to explain and defend the truths of his word! May he graciously forgive and bring to light whatever error may unconsciously have crept into it, and render it subservient, in so far as it accords with the revelations of his mind and will, to the enlightened and profitable study of those Scriptures, which make wise to salvation!

CONTENTS.

☞ In the following Table of Contents, as some topics have been introduced in the course of the Volume, by way of illustration or otherwise, which might possibly have been either omitted, or differently placed, they are here printed in italics, that they may be the more easily distinguished.

PART I.

INQUIRY INTO THE PRINCIPLES OF TYPICAL INTERPRETATION, WITH A VIEW TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE REAL NATURE AND DESIGN OF TYPES, AND HOW THEY ARE TO BE ASCERTAINED AND APPLIED, . 13—163

CHAPTER I.

THE PAST AND PRESENT STATE OF THEOLOGICAL OPINION REGARDING THE TYPES, EMBRACING A SHORT HISTORY AND EXAMINATION OF THE VIEWS WHICH HAVE BEEN SUCCESSIVELY ENTERTAINED ON THE SUBJECT, FROM THE FIRST AGES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE PRESENT TIMES . . 13—39

Opinions of the Fathers, p. 14,—much given to allegorical interpretations, —*the proper distinction between the allegorical and the typical*, 14–16.—Origen, 17–19.—Clement and other Greek Fathers, 19–20.—Augustine, 20.—Reformers, 21.—Cocceius and his school, including Glass, Witsius, Vitringa, Mather, Guild, &c., 21–24.—The leading errors of that school, 24–26.—Spencer's influence hostile to it, 26.—Clarke, Jortin, M'Ewen, 27.—Hutchinsonian school, 28.—School of Marsh, 29, including Macknight, Vanmildert, Chevalier, Horne, Stuart, &c.—Objections against it, 30–34.—Baehr, De Wette, Tholuck, Olshausen, &c., 34–37.—Dr. Davidson, Mr. Alexander, ... 37—39

CHAPTER II.

THE EXACT NATURE, USE, AND DESIGN OF TYPES, CONSIDERED WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO WHAT ARE COMMONLY CALLED RITUAL TYPES, OR THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS OF MOSES, ... 39—51

What essentially implied in the relation of type and antitype, 40–41.—The type not simply for Old Testament believers, 42,—must exhibit the same elements of truth with antitype, 43,—and that in a simpler and more palpable form, 43–44.—Ritual types prophetic symbols, and how, 44,—exemplified in an *explanation of the rite of sacrifice*, 45–46.—In what respect ritual institutions as a whole *shadows*, or *rudiments* of the gospel, 46–50,—how more easily comprehensible than the things of the gospel, 49.—The small number of ritual types particularly explained in New Testament Scripture, ... 50—51

CHAPTER III.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED, WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO WHAT ARE CALLED HISTORICAL TYPES, SHOWING THESE TO BE ESSENTIALLY ONE IN CHARACTER WITH THE OTHER, AND EQUALLY NECESSARY AS A PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL, ... 52—68

Historical types shown to be of the same nature as the ritual, 52–56,—particularly exemplified in the brazen serpent and the deluge.—Symbolical actions of prophets, wherein the same with, and different from types, 56.—The greater closeness and intimacy of the relation between type and antitype as now explained, compared with the view currently entertained, and exemplified in some instances, 56–58.—That the Old Testament is full of typical matter, evident from the essential nature and design of types, as well as from express statements in Scripture, 58–60.—Further shown from *the character of the Book of Psalms*, 60–62.—Use and influence of typical institutions and providences in preparing the way for Christ, 62–66.—Chief import of the expression, *the fulness of time*, ... 66—68

CHAPTER IV.

CONSEQUENCES GROWING OUT OF THE VIEWS NOW UNFOLDED, FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF PARTICULAR TYPES, AND FORMED INTO SOME GENERAL RULES NECESSARY TO BE OBSERVED IN CONDUCTING INVESTIGATIONS OF THIS NATURE, ... 68—99

1. Nothing to be regarded as typical, which is of an improper and sinful nature.—The ground of this explained, and exemplified in the case of Esau and Jacob, 69–72.—Mistakes of some late writers, in particular Kanne, 72–73.—Certain limitations to the principle, 73–74.—2. The existence and meaning of particular types to be ascertained, not from the light possessed by the ancient worshippers concerning their prospective fulfilment, but from the light thrown on them by the great truths and realities of the gospel, 74.—The ground of this principle explained, 75.—Violated by many modern writers, Owen, Edwards, Warburton, Graves, Kanne, Chevalier, &c., 76.—*Impossibility of ascertaining how far, or when Old Testament believers understood the ultimate meaning of either prophecy or type*, 77–79,—*but certain that their views of both were very defective*, 79–81.—3. In the interpretation of types our first care must be to make ourselves acquainted with the truths or ideas involved in them, merely as providential transactions or religious services, 81.—The ground of this principle explained, and exemplified in the case of Jacob at Bethel, the brazen serpent, &c., viewed in connexion with the erroneous explanations of Guild, Kanne, Justin Martyr, and others, 82–86.—4. Though each type is to be regarded as having but one radical meaning, yet the fundamental idea or principle involved in it may often be capable of more than one application to gospel things, as, for example, to Christ and his people, 86–91.—5. Due regard must be had to the essential difference between the nature of type and antitype,—the one being the development of the same truth or principle on a lower stage than the other, or in regard to inferior objects and concerns, 91–95.—Two apparent exceptions noticed, *Christ's descent into Egypt*, and *the preservation of his bones from being broken*, . 95—99

CHAPTER V.

THE CONNEXION BETWEEN TYPE AND PROPHECY,—VARIOUS COMBINATIONS OF THE ONE WITH THE OTHER, GIVING RISE TO WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED "THE DOUBLE SENSE OF PROPHECY."—THE SUBJECT EXPLAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES ALREADY ADVANCED, FOLLOWED BY SOME REMARKS ON THE VIEWS COMMONLY ENTERTAINED REGARDING IT, . . . 99—134

A common character belonging to type and prophecy, 99.—A further connexion between them arising from the frequent combination of the one with the other, 100.—This combination exists in three different forms. —1. When a typical transaction is historically described, and the description, as being that of a prophetical circumstance or event, comes to possess a prophetical character, exemplified in Ps. lxix. 9, xliv. 22, Isa. xlix. 8, Ps. lxxviii. 2, (note,) Hos. xi. 1, Ex. xii. 36, 101–105.—2. When the essential truths and principles embodied in some typical transaction are taken up and applied in an accompanying prediction, which at once explains the type, and expressly delineates to the eye of faith the coming reality, 105.—Illustrated first in the case of Hannah's song, as compared with the Virgin's, 106–108,—then in the 2d Psalm, including an account of *the institution of the kingly government in Israel*, why it was at first opposed by God, and afterwards employed as the occasion and form of conveying some of the clearest predictions concerning the Messiah, 109–114.—3. When a typical transaction still future, was contemplated as present by the eye of the prophet, and was connected by him with a word of prophecy, which pre-supposed what was typical, and carried forward the truths and principles embodied in it to the concerns of Christ's kingdom, 115–122,—exemplified in 2 Sam. vii., Ps. xlv., lxxii., and the latter portion of Isaiah's prophecies.—Objections against the *double sense*, 122–128.—Chief fault in most, who oppose the double sense, ascribing another and lower sense to many predictions, which directly point to Christ, exemplified in Isaiah's *prediction of the birth of Immanuel*, ch. vii., ... 128—134

CHAPTER VI.

THE PLACE DUE TO THE SUBJECT OF TYPES AS A BRANCH OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY, AND THE BENEFITS IT IS FITTED TO YIELD, WHEN RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD AND APPLIED, ... 135—163

It is of great value and importance on various accounts.—1. It shows a very close analogy between God's method of instruction with the Old Testament church, and Christ's with his disciples during his personal ministry, 135–139.—2. It discloses an analogy of faith under the Old and New Covenants, a similarity in the principles taught and embraced under each, 139.—This exemplified in what appears to be the greatest contrast between the Old and New Testament, *the withholding in the former of any clear revelation of a future state of reward and punishment*—shown that, according to the divine plan, it could not be otherwise, but that still, the hopes and principles of the patriarchal and Jewish believers were substantially one with the Christians, 140–146.—The erroneous notions of Spencer, Graves, Warburton, Whately, &c., regarding *the true foundation of the belief in a future state of reward and punishment*, and the probable effect of God's extraordinary providence toward the

Jews in regard to it, contrasted with the sounder views of Butler and Hengstenberg, 146–150.—3. The proper study of typology explains why most of the historical types consist of comparatively small and unimportant facts—this, though often objected to, absolutely necessary to their fulfilling the object in view, as preparations for the kingdom of Christ, 150–153.—4. The great service it is fitted to render in helping out the spiritual idea in the minds of believers concerning divine things, and enabling them to apprehend it in its proper fulness, exemplified in 1 Pet. i. 2, "unto the obedience *and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus*," 154–156,—and in Abraham's covenant-standing as typical of that of believers, 156–157,—also *in the history of David and Joseph as prefigurative of corresponding events in the person and kingdom of Christ*, 157—163

PART II.

APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES BROUGHT OUT IN THE PRECEDING INVESTIGATION, TO THE PROPER EXPLANATION OF THE TYPICAL MATTER OF OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURE, ... 164—290

Preliminary remarks, in which are stated some things necessary to be observed in making the intended application, . . . 164—169

CHAPTER I.

THE TRUTHS SYMBOLIZED AND TYPIFIED IN THE PATRIARCHAL RELIGION, COMPREHENDING SUCH ALSO AS WERE EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE FALL.

SECTION FIRST.

THE TRUTHS EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE FALL, BEING THOSE ON WHICH THE FIRST SYMBOLICAL RELIGION WAS BASED, 170—181

All typico-symbolical institutions necessarily subsequent to the fall, 170–172.—But even then founded upon, and pre-suppose certain truths brought out in the transactions connected with the fall.—These were, 1. The doctrine of human guilt and depravity, 172.—2. Of the holy character of God, as loving righteousness and hating sin, 173.—Of salvation by grace, 174.—Of the principle of headship, . . 175—181

SECTION SECOND.

THE TREE OF LIFE, ... 181—186

The original purpose of that tree, 181–182,—what truths symbolized in man's exclusion from it, ... 182—186

SECTION THIRD.

THE CHERUBIM AND THE FLAMING SWORD, ... 187—202

The flaming sword simply a weapon of defence to guard the way to the tree of life, 187.—The cherubim different, *ib.*—Compound forms, and variable, 187–188.—What denoted by their being called *living creatures*, 188,—by their never resting, 189.—What signified by their component parts, by the ox, 190,—by the lion, 190,—by the eagle, 191,—by man, 191.—What indicated by their appearance in the garden of Eden,

around the throne of God, and in the holy of holies, 192–194.—Objections to Baehr's view, 194–196.—Typical of human nature in its redeemed and glorified state, 196–198.—Objections to the views of Michaelis, Herder, Spencer, Bochart, Rosenmuller, &c., 199–201.—The place and bearing they were intended to have in the early worship of God, ... 201—202

SECTION FOURTH.

THE PRIMITIVE MODE OF WORSHIP BY SACRIFICE, ... 202—214

This the only mode of primitive worship, and certainly existed as a divine institution shortly after the fall, 202–205.—All theories framed to account for its human origin inconsistent with the facts and statements of Scripture, 205–210.—Various things which strengthen the conclusion of its divine origin, 210.—Its symbolical and typical import, . 211—214

CHAPTER II.

THE IDEAS AND PRINCIPLES DEVELOPED IN THE FACTS OF PATRIARCHAL HISTORY, OR THE TYPES EMBODIED IN THE TRANSACTIONS OF THAT SPECIAL PROVIDENCE WHICH GOD EXERCISED TOWARD HIS CHURCH, FROM THE PERIOD OF THE FALL, TO THE EVENTS CONNECTED WITH THE DISPENSATION OF MOSES, ... 214—290

SECTION FIRST.

ELECTION BY GRACE,—appearing in the type, in Abel, Seth, and others of the antediluvian world, in Noah and his family, in Abraham and his family, &c., 215–217,—in the antitype, first in the man Christ Jesus, then in his people, 217–219.—Scriptural proof of the doctrine, 220–221.—Practical improvement of it, ... 221—222

SECTION SECOND.

ENMITY OF THE WORLD AGAINST GOD'S PURPOSE OF ELECTION,—appearing in the type, in the history of Abel, and other pious antediluvians, in the families of Noah, Abraham, and Jacob, 222–224,—in the antitype, in the history of Christ and of his people, ... 224—226

SECTION THIRD.

THE TWOFOLD PROCESS, SALVATION WITH DESTRUCTION,—appearing in the type, in the events of the deluge, which saved God's people by destroying their enemies, and in the deliverances of Israel from the hands of Pharaoh and other adversaries, 227–231,—(notes to p. 227 on *Enoch's translation*, and to p. 229 on *Noah's being saved by water*, 1 Pet. iii. 20;) in the antitype, in Christ and his people, with practical reflections, 231—236

SECTION FOURTH.

THE ROOT OF LIFE AND BLESSING IN THE SAVED—FAITH, appearing in the type, in the earlier patriarchs, but specially in Abraham, with an inquiry on what objects the faith of Abraham rested, 236–240,—in Jacob with a special reference to his manner of getting the blessing, and to the vision of the ladder at Bethel, 241–243,—in the antitype, in all Christ's sincere people,—faith the turning-point of their salvation, 243—247

SECTION FIFTH.

THE FRUIT OF FAITH A RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH DISTINGUISHES BELIEVERS FROM THE WORLD, AND MAKES THEM SUBJECTS OF REWARD; in regard to the first point appearing in the type, in Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, 247–251, (note to p. 249–251, on *the offering up of Isaac, and showing this not to have been designed to be typical of Christ's sacrifice,*) in the antitype, in Christ's people, 251–252.—In regard to the second point, appearing in the type, most of all in Abraham's history after the offering up of Isaac, but also in the other patriarchs, 252–253,—in the antitype, in Christ's people, showing how the believer receives all of grace, and at the same time is to be dealt with according to his works, . 254—260

SECTION SIXTH.

FAITH'S PRESENT DOWRY OF GOOD—THE DIGNITY AND BLESSING OF SONS,—appearing in the type, in the honour conferred at different times on Abraham, (note on *the person of Melchisedec*, at p. 261,) on Isaac, on Jacob, and on Joseph, 260–263,—in the antitype, in every sinner, as soon as he believes on Christ, ... 263—264

SECTION SEVENTH.

FAITH'S FINAL PORTION, OR THE HOPE OF THE INHERITANCE.—This always pointing to something connected with this region of creation, yet with that in a very different state from what it now is; in the earlier worshippers with a paradise restored, in Abraham and his pious descendants with an antitypical Canaan, to be entered on after the resurrection from the dead—hence the hope of the resurrection, and of a state of blessedness beyond, inseparable from the patriarchal religion in all the faithful, 264–270,—this confirmed by the sentiments of Jewish doctors, and the difference pointed out between the hopes of patriarchs, and those of heathens respecting an hereafter, 270–273,—also from Scripture, 273–275.—The antitypical Canaan shown to be the renovated earth, which a redeemed church shall receive as its purchased possession, when Christ comes in his glory, ... 275—290

APPENDIX.

ON THE BEARING WHICH THE RELATION THE FAMILY OF ABRAHAM HELD IN RESPECT TO THE EARTHLY INHERITANCE, HAS ON THE QUESTION OF THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE, . . . 291—326

THE

TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE

INVESTIGATED AND APPLIED.

PART I.

INQUIRY INTO THE PRINCIPLES OF TYPICAL INTERPRETATION, WITH A VIEW TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE REAL NATURE AND DESIGN OF TYPES, AND HOW THEY ARE TO BE ASCERTAINED AND APPLIED.

CHAPTER I.

THE PAST AND PRESENT STATE OF THEOLOGICAL OPINION REGARDING THE TYPES, EMBRACING A SHORT HISTORY AND EXAMINATION OF THE VIEWS WHICH HAVE BEEN SUCCESSIVELY ENTERTAINED ON THE SUBJECT, FROM THE FIRST AGES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE PRESENT TIMES.

Few branches of theology have given rise to such variety of opinion among divines as that of types, and none, perhaps, has derived less benefit from the new lights and improved methods of investigation, which have been introduced into theological study. Even those who have been perfectly at one on the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and the leading principles of scriptural interpretation, have yet differed widely, not only in their methods of explaining particular types, but also in what they allowed to possess this character, and the degree of importance they attached to it. Extreme opinions have undoubtedly been held on both sides, nor have they yet entirely disappeared from the church, although there can be little doubt, that the progress of opinion has been steadily tending for many years, both to lessen the amount, and to depreciate the value, of the typical matter of Old Testament scripture.

1. To glance first at the Fathers of the Christian church,—the views which they entertained upon the subject, are chiefly to be gathered from the particular examples which are to be met with in their works; for in none of the earlier Christian writers do we find any clear and well-defined principles of interpretation laid down, either on this, or any other branch of theological study, unless perhaps some exception be allowed in favour of Origen. And even he, voluminous as his works are, may scarcely be excepted; for with such vagueness and confusion has he described the principles which guided his interpretations of Scripture, that by some he has been understood to hold, that there is a fourfold, by others a threefold, and by others again only a twofold sense in the sacred text. The truth seems to be, that while he contended for a fourfold application of Scripture, he held only a twofold sense, strictly so called; and, considered in a general point of view, his principles of interpretation were not materially different from those adopted by the great majority of the Greek fathers. But before stating how these bore upon the subject now under consideration, it will be necessary to point out a distinction, too often lost sight of both in earlier and later times, between allegorical and typical interpretations, properly so called. These have generally been confounded together, as if they were essentially one in principle, and differing only in the extent to which it is carried. And yet there is an important distinction between them, which Bishop Marsh, though he has applied the same general name to both, has to a certain extent so judiciously and clearly unfolded, that I shall introduce the subject in his words.

"There are two different modes, in which Scripture history has been thus allegorized. According to one mode, facts and circumstances, especially those recorded in the Old Testament, have been applied to other facts and circumstances, of which they have been described as *representative*. According to the other mode, those facts and circumstances have been described as *mere emblems*. The former mode is warranted by the practice of the sacred writers themselves; for when facts and circumstances are *so* applied, they are applied as *types* of those things to which the application is made. But the latter mode of allegorical interpretation has no such authority in its favour, though attempts have been made to procure such authority. For the same things are *then* described, not as types, or as real facts, but as mere *ideal* representations, like the immediate representation in allegory. By this mode, therefore, history is not only *treated* as allegory, but *converted* into allegory; or, in other words, history is thus converted into *fable*." The bishop goes on to vindicate the apostle Paul from having in this sense allegorized scripture, referring to what he says in Galatians of Sarah and Hagar, and showing that in the use made of it by the apostle, the historical verity of the Old Testament narrative was not destroyed, but preserved. "In short," he concludes, "when St. Paul allegorized the history of the two sons of Abraham, and compared them with the two covenants, he did nothing more than

represent the first as *types*, the latter as *antitypes*. Though he *treated* that portion of the Mosaic history in the same manner as we treat an allegory, he did not thereby *convert* it into allegory. In the interpretation, therefore, of the Scriptures, it is essentially necessary that we observe the exact boundaries between the notion of an allegory, and the notion of a type. And it is the more necessary, that some of our own commentators, and among others even Macknight, misled by the use of the term *allegory* in our authorized version, have considered it as synonymous with *type*. An allegory, as already observed, is a *fictitious* narrative; a type is something *real*. An allegory is a picture of the *imagination;* a type is an *historical fact*. It is true, that typical interpretation may, in *one* sense, be considered as a species of allegorical interpretation; that they are so far alike, as being equally an interpretation of *things;* that they are equally founded on resemblance; that the type corresponds to its antitype, as the *immediate* representation in an allegory corresponds to its *ultimate* representation. Yet the *quality* of the things compared, as well as the *purport* of the comparison, is very different in the two cases. And though a type in reference to its antitype is called a *shadow*, while the latter is called the *substance*, yet the use of these terms does not imply that the former has less historical verity than the latter."*

In the general principles here stated, and also in the particular view given of the passage in Galatians, the most judicious commentators concur with Bishop Marsh. For example, Calvin, in his annotations on that passage, thus writes: "Paul certainly does not mean, that Moses wrote the history for the purpose of being turned into an allegory, but points out in what way the history may be made to answer the present subject. This is done by observing a figurative representation of the church there delineated. And a mystical interpretation of this sort was not inconsistent with the true and literal meaning, when a comparison was drawn between the church and the family of Abraham. As the house of Abraham was then a true church, so it is beyond all doubt, that the principal and most memorable events which happened in it are so many types to us. As in circumcision, in sacrifices, in the whole Levitical priesthood, there was an allegory, as there is an allegory at the present day in our sacraments, so was there likewise in the house of Abraham; but this does not involve a departure from the literal meaning."

It is to be understood, that these quotations are made simply for the purpose of explaining a distinction in regard to two modes of interpretation, the one only of which is warranted in scripture, and not as if every expression they contain were approved of. I cannot but regard it, in particular, as unhappy, that after pointing out the distinction so clearly, Bishop Marsh should still have given to both kinds the one name of *allegory*, and should have stated, that although the apostle in Galatians had not converted the Mosaic

* Marsh's Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible, pp. 350—354.

narrative into allegory, he had yet treated it as allegory. No doubt the apostle himself calls the use he makes of the history an *allegorizing* of it; and in an abstract general point of view, there is so much common to type and allegory, that the name of the one may, especially where precise distinctions are not aimed at, be at times applied to the other. But as the use, which the apostle makes of that portion of Old Testament history, is essentially what we understand by a typical application of it, and as allegorical interpretations, in the ordinary acceptation, and also the more proper sense of the term, have been applied to extract a very different use from Old Testament history, it is certainly to be regretted that the two *names* should still be interchanged, as it inevitably leads to the two *things* being improperly confounded. An allegory is a narrative, either expressly feigned for the purpose, or if describing facts which really took place, describing them only for the purpose, of representing certain higher truths or principles, than the narrative in its immediate representation, whether real or fictitious, could possibly have taught. The immediate representation, therefore, is either invented, or at least used, as a mere cover for the higher sense, which may refer to things ever so remote from those primarily denoted, if only the corresponding relations are preserved. So that allegorical interpretations of scripture properly comprehend the two following cases, and these only: 1. When the scriptural narrative is actually held to have had no foundation in fact, to be a mere mythos or fabulous representation, devised for the sole purpose of exhibiting the mysteries of divine truth; 2. Or when, without moving any question about the real or fictitious nature of the narrative, it is yet considered in its immediate representation as incapable of any adequate or satisfactory sense, and is consequently applied precisely as if it had been fabulous, to unfold something of an entirely different kind from what it could be understood, in its direct and obvious sense, to relate to. The difference between allegorical interpretations, in either of these senses, and those which are properly called typical, will only be fully brought out, when we have explained the proper nature of a type, and the grounds both in reason and scripture on which it rests. It will be enough meanwhile to say, that typical interpretations of the historical parts of Old Testament scripture, differ from the *former* kind of allegorical ones, in that they indispensably require the reality of the facts contained in the history; and from the *latter*, in requiring, besides this, that the same truth or principle be embodied equally in the type and the antitype. The typical is not a different or a higher sense, but a different or higher application of the same sense.

Now to return with these explanations to the writings of the earlier fathers, and using the expressions *typical* and *allegorical* in the senses now respectively ascribed to them, there can be no doubt, that the fathers generally were much given both to typical and allegorical interpretations,—the Greek fathers more to allegorical than to typical,—and to allegorical more in the second, than

in the first sense described above. They do not seem for the most part to have discredited the plain truth or reality of the statements made in Old Testament scripture; they seem rather to have regarded the sense of the letter as true and good so far as it went, but capable only of yielding a very meagre and elementary instruction, and therefore chiefly to be used as the vehicle of a much more refined and ethereal instruction. Origen, however, certainly went farther than this, and expressly denied that many things in the Old Testament had any foundation in reality. In his Principia (lib. iv.) he affirms, that "when the scripture history could not otherwise be accommodated to the explanation of spiritual things, matters have been inserted which did not take place, nay, which *could* not have taken place, and others again, which though they might have occurred, yet never actually did so." Again, when speaking of some notices in the life of Rebecca, he says, "In these things, I have often told you, there is not a relation of histories, but a concoction of mysteries."* And in like manner, in his annotations on the first chapters of Genesis, he plainly scouts the idea of God's having literally clothed our first parents with the skins of slain beasts, calls it absurd, ridiculous, and unworthy of God, and declares that in such a case the naked letter is not to be adhered to as true, but exists only for the spiritual treasure, which is concealed in it.†

Statements of this kind are of too frequent occurrence in the writings of Origen to have arisen from inadvertence or oversight; they were, indeed, intimately connected with the vicious system of interpretation which he adopted, and render it impossible to defend him from the serious charge of having sought, in the worst and most obnoxious sense, to turn portions of the word of God into fable. The error was essentially the same in kind, though originated by a different form of philosophy, and applied to purposes correspondingly different, with that which was lately so rampant in Germany, and which ran out at last into the wild extravagance of maintaining the entire history of Jesus to be only one great mythos, or fabulous representation of divine truths. At the same time, it must be admitted in behalf of Origen, that however possessed of what has been called "the allegorical fury," he does not appear *generally* to have discredited the facts of sacred history, and probably differed from the other divines of the Alexandrian school chiefly in the excess to which he went in decrying the literal sense as carnal and puerile, and extolling the mystical as alone suited for those who had become acquainted with the true wisdom. It would be out of place here, however, to enter into the investigation of this point, as it is not immediately connected with our present inquiry; but to make more manifest the arbitrary nature of this mode of interpretation, and the distinction between it and what is strictly typological, it may be of use to bring forward a single specimen. We shall take it from Origen's homily on Abra-

* Works, Vol. II., p. 88, Ed. Delarue. † Ibid. p. 29.

ham's marriage to Keturah. He does not actually disown the fact of such a marriage having actually taken place in real life, though his language most naturally carries that interpretation, but he intimates that this, in common with the other marriages of the patriarchs, contained a sacramental mystery. And what might this be? Why, nothing less than to teach us, "that there is no end to wisdom, and that old age sets no bounds to improvement in knowledge. The death of Sarah (he says) is to be understood as the perfectionment of virtue. But he who has attained to a consummate and perfect virtue must always be employed in some kind of learning—which learning is called by the divine word, his wife. Abraham, therefore, when an old man, and his body in a manner dead, took Keturah to wife. I think it was better, according to the exposition we follow, that the wife should have been received when his body was dead, and his members were mortified. For we have a greater capacity for wisdom, when we bear about the dying of Christ in our mortal body. Then, Keturah, whom Abraham married in his old age, is by interpretation *incense*, or sweet odour. For he said, even as Paul did, 'We are a sweet savour of Christ.' Sin is a foul and putrid thing; but if any of you, in whom this no longer dwells, have the fragrance of righteousness, the sweetness of mercy, and by prayer continually offer up incense to God, ye also have taken Keturah to wife."* And on he goes to show, how many such wives may be taken; hospitality is one, the care of the poor another, patience a third, each virtue, in short, a wife; and hence it was that the patriarchs had so many wives, and that Solomon possessed them even by hundreds, he having received plenitude of wisdom like the sand on the sea-shore, and consequently grace to exercise the largest number of virtues.

This is a genuine specimen of allegorical interpretation, having for its subject-matter a story, either entirely fabulous, or at least treated as if it were so. It is of no moment for all the purposes which such a mode of interpretation might serve, whether Abraham and Keturah had any substantial existence, and whether their marriage was a real fact in history, or an incident fitly thrown into a fictitious narrative, constructed for the purpose of symbolizing the hidden doctrines of a divine philosophy. If it had been treated as a type, and not as an allegory, whatever meaning might have been ascribed to it as a representation of gospel mysteries, the story must have been assumed as real, and the act of Abraham made to correspond with something essentially the same in kind—some sort of union, for example, between parties holding a similar relation to each other, as Abraham did to Keturah. In this, though there might have been error in the particular use and application made of it, there would at least have been some appearance of a probable ground for it to rest upon; but in the true allegorical form, which it presents in the above quotation, all seems what may well be called "the baseless fabric of a vision." For

* Hom. VI. in Genes.

what connexion, either in the nature of things, or as determined by the word of God, can we fancy to exist between the death of one wife and the consummation of virtue in the husband, or the marriage of another and his pursuit of knowledge? Why might not the former as well, if not more fitly, represent the loss of virtue, and the latter a disposition to relax the search for the hidden treasures of knowledge and the higher graces of a Christian life? There would evidently be as good ground for asserting the one as the other; and, indeed, with such a mode of interpretation, the word of God would become no better than an Egyptian hieroglyph, as interpreted by the cabalistic philosophy of the middle ages, which could be made to express dogmas ever so varied and profound, according to the fancies or the creeds of those who assumed the office of interpretation, and instead of rendering inspired Scripture the handmaid of a higher instruction, it could only turn this into one vast sea of uncertainty, disorder and confusion.

As a proof of this, we need only mention the use which Clement of Alexandria, Origen's master, has made (Stroma. l. I. p. 333,) of another portion of sacred history, which treats of Abraham's wives. The instruction he derives from the patriarch's marriage successively to Sarah and Hagar, is that a Christian ought to cultivate philosophy and the liberal arts, before he devotes himself wholly to the study of divine wisdom. And the way he makes out this is, that Abraham is the image of a perfect Christian—Sarah the image of Christian wisdom—and Hagar the image of philosophy, or human wisdom. Abraham lived with Sarah for a long time in a state of connubial sterility, whence it is inferred, that a Christian, so long as he confines himself to the study of divine wisdom and religion alone, will never bring forth any great or excellent fruits. Abraham, then, with the consent of Sarah, takes to him Hagar, which proves, according to Clement, that a Christian ought to embrace the wisdom of this world or philosophy, and that Sarah or divine wisdom will not withhold her consent. Lastly, after Hagar had borne Ishmael to Abraham, he resumed his intercourse with Sarah, and of her begat Isaac; the true import of which is, that a Christian, after having once thoroughly grounded himself in human learning and philosophy, will, if he then devotes himself to the culture of divine wisdom, be capable of propagating the race of true Christians, and of rendering essential service to the church. Here we have two entirely different senses extracted from the narrative, by the master and the pupil; and, on the allegorical hypothesis, many more might with equal justice be adopted, while it is quite impossible to assign any ground of preference to one more than to another. The whole is left to the arbitrary caprice and fancy of each individual.

This vicious mode of interpretation, and manifest perversion of the plain meaning of Scripture, was not confined by Origen merely to the historical parts of the Old Testament, but was carried by him with unfortunate consistency through the greater part of Scripture. Even when explaining those portions of the Mosaic ri-

tual, on which the Epistle to the Hebrews has furnished an inspired commentary, he could not abstain from his favourite plan of allegorizing, and searching for what he considered a higher sense. And in this, he was so far from being singular, that he himself was a follower of others, and was in turn followed by others—the Greek fathers as a body pursued the same system. One of the ablest of them, and a predecessor of Origen, the Clement just mentioned, even applied the allegorical principle to the moral parts of Scripture—to the law of the ten commandments, in which Origen differed from his master, though he could scarcely have been charged with inconsistency if he had concurred with him. For the allegorical system of interpretation, as then pursued, was just the offspring of that false philosophy, which treated every thing connected with matter and the common relations of life, as beneath the dignity, or adverse to the proper good of the soul, which behooved therefore to be ever soaring above such low and inferior things into the high abstractions of a contemplative theosophy. The fathers of the Latin school were much less infected with the spirit of this philosophy, and their interpretations of Scripture consequently partake much less of a transcendental and visionary character. Not a few of them, however, did occasionally adopt allegorical interpretations, though much more sparingly than was usual with the divines of the Greek church; and in so far as typical meanings were concerned, each writer in both churches seems to have acted without any proper rule or restraint, excepting what might be imposed by the natural cast of his own mind, or the nature of his subject. If in the eastern church we find such objects as the tree of life in the garden of Eden, the rod of Moses, Moses himself with his arms extended during the conflict with Amalek, regarded as types of the cross; in the western church we find Augustine, who paid more attention than most of his brethren to the work of interpretation, and whose name as a theologian soon eclipsed that of all others, discovering types with equal freedom in the facts of Old Testament history. As when, to look only into his work on the Psalms, he answers the question, "Wherefore did Christ enter into the sleep of death?" by saying, "Because Adam slept, when Eve was formed from his side, Adam being the figure of Christ, Eve as the mother of the living the figure of the church; and as she was formed from Adam while he was asleep, so was it when Christ slept on the cross, that the sacraments of the church flowed from his side."* Or again, when Saul is declared to have been the type of death, unwillingly appointed by God king over Israel, just as he reluctantly subjects his people to the stroke of death; and David's deliverance from the hand of Saul foreshadowed our deliverance through Christ from the power of death; while in that escape of David, coupled with the suffering of Ahimelech on his account, if not in his stead, there was a prefiguration of Christ's death and resurrection.† It would be alike needless and unprofitable to multiply examples far-

* In Ps. xli. † In Ps. lii.

ther, or prosecute the subject more in detail. Enough surely has been advanced to show, that the earlier divines of the Christian church had no sound or enlightened principles to guide them in the discovery or application of what is typical in Old Testament scripture, and that neither in their principles nor their practice is any proper safeguard to be found against extravagant and fanciful conceits.*

2. Passing over the dark gulf of the middle ages, we come down to the period of the Reformation. At that memorable era a mighty advance was made, not only beyond the ages immediately preceding, but also beyond those which produced the writings of the fathers, in attaining to a sound and rational interpretation of the word of God. The text of Scripture was examined like that of other ancient writings, and the manifold sense, which the most learned theologians had generally concurred in ascribing to it, was with one consent discarded by the leaders of the Reformation. Luther denounced mystical and allegorical interpretations as "trifling and foolish fables, with which the Scriptures were rent into so many and diverse senses, that silly poor consciences could receive no certain doctrine of any thing."† And Calvin, in like manner repudiating all various meanings, declares that "the true meaning of Scripture is the natural and obvious meaning, by which we ought resolutely to abide," and speaks of the "licentious system" of Origen and the allegorists, as undoubtedly a contrivance of Satan to undermine the authority of Scripture, and to take away from the reading of it the true advantage."‡ It would be beside our present purpose to inquire how these and the other eminent divines of that age exemplified such correct views in their general interpretations of Scripture; and as, from the circumstances in which they were placed, their attention was comparatively little drawn to the subject of types, and they formed no distinct school concerning it, we must descend a little further down to about the middle of the seventeenth century, when the science of theology came to be studied more in detail, and the types consequently received a separate investigation. About that period arose what is called the Cocceian school, which, though it did not revive the double sense of the Alexandrian school, (for Cocceius expressly disclaimed any thing but the literal and historical sense, as the proper one of Scripture,) yet by searching for an excessive fulness of meaning in the words of Scripture, was chargeable with somewhat of the caprice and irregularity of the ancient allegorists. Cocceius himself, less distinguished as a systematic writer in theology, than as a Hebrew scho-

* Those who wish to see the opinions of the earlier Christian writers treated more at large, may consult Davidson's Hermeneutics, or, if German scholars, Klausen's Hermeneutik. The latter thus marks the change introduced by the Alexandrian school of divines: "It is in Clement and Origen that we find the allegorical method of exposition first not merely applied to the writings of the New Testament, but also based on a general idea of the nature of exposition, and connected with definite rules. So that, while it is wrong to name Origen the father of allegorical exposition, he is well entitled to be regarded as its scientific promoter," p. 100.

† On Gal. ch. iv. v. 26.

‡ On Gal. ch. iv. 22.

lar and learned expositor of Scripture, in which respect he did essential service to the cause of biblical science, left no elaborate statement of his views in regard to typical and allegorical interpretations, and it is chiefly from his annotations on particular passages, and the more systematic works of his followers, that these are to be gathered. How freely he was disposed to draw upon Old Testament history for types of gospel things, may be understood from this one example, (taken from his Cur. Prior. in Gen. x.,) his conceiving Asshur going out and building Nineveh, to have typified the Turk or Mussulman power, which at once sprang from the kingdom, and shook the dominion, of antichrist. He evidently conceived, that *every* event in Old Testament history had its antitype in the history of Christ and his church. And how much he felt himself at liberty to allegorize Scripture, may also be understood from his subjecting the eighth Psalm to that arbitrary mode of interpretation; according to which he understands by the *sheep* there spoken of, Christ's flock—by the *oxen*, those who labour in the service of Christ—by *the beasts of the field*, such as are strangers to the city and kingdom of God, barbarians and savages—by *the fowl of the air and fish of the sea*, persons at a still greater distance from godliness, immersed in worldly pleasures or puffed up with a vain and haughty disposition, so that there is nothing so wild and untractable on earth but it shall be brought under the rule and dominion of Christ.

It does not appear, however, that the views of Cocceius differed materially from those, which were held by some who preceded him, and considering, along with this, how little he did to reduce his views to a systematic form, it is rather strange that the school in question should have taken its name from him. If we turn to one of the earlier editions of Glass's Philologia Sacra, published before Cocceius had commenced his critical labours, (the first was published before he was born,) we shall find the principles of allegorical and typical investigations laid down, with a latitude which Cocceius himself could scarcely have quarrelled with. Indeed his examples require no more to justify them, than the principles stated by Glass, and though the latter in his section on allegories has to throw himself back chiefly on the fathers, he yet produces some quotations in support of his views both on these and types from some writers of his own age. There seems, indeed, to have been no difference of an essential nature between the views of Glass, Cocceius, Witsius, and Vitringa; and though the first wrote some time before, and the last about half a century later than Cocceius, no injustice can be done to any of them by taking the sentiments of one as substantially the sentiments of all. Like the fathers, they did not sufficiently distinguish between allegorical and typical interpretations, but regarded the one as only a particular form of the other, and both as equally warranted by New Testament scripture. Consequently the rules and principles which they adopted were very much the same for both kinds of interpretation, though at present we must confine our remarks to the typical de-

partment. They held, then, that there was a twofold sort of types, the one *innate*, consisting of those types which are somewhere in Scripture itself declared to have been such, and explained; the other *inferred*, consisting of such as, though not particularized in Scripture, were yet on probable grounds inferred by interpreters, as conformable to the analogy of faith, and the practice of the inspired writers in regard to similar examples.* The latter class were understood by the persons we speak of to be equally proper and valid with the other, and were distinguished from those, which were sometimes forged by Papists, and were at variance with the analogies just mentioned. Of course, from their very nature, they could only be employed for the support and confirmation of truths already received, and not to prove what was otherwise doubtful; but still they were not on that account to be less diligently searched for, or less confidently used, because thus only could Christ be found in all the Scriptures, which all testify of him.

It must be owned that the grounds on which this system rested were chiefly loose and general principles, which left ample scope for any one who chose to run into endless extravagancies; and in practice, a mere resemblance, however accidental or unimportant, between something in the Old and something in the New Testament scriptures, was deemed sufficient to constitute the one a type of the other. Hence, in the very learned and able authors above referred to, we find the name of Abel (emptiness) viewed as prefiguring our Lord's humiliation; the occupation of Abel, Christ's office as the great Shepherd of the sheep; the withdrawment of Isaac from his father's house to the land of Moriah, Christ's being led out of the temple to Calvary; Adam's awaking out of sleep, Christ's resurrection from the dead; Samson's meeting a young lion by the way, and the transactions that followed, Christ's meeting Paul on the road to Damascus, with the important train of events to which it led; David's gathering to himself a party from the distressed, the bankrupt and discontented, Christ's receiving into his church publicans and sinners,—with many others of a like nature.

Were it necessary, examples in great number of a like kind might be produced from writers of our own country, such as Mather,† Keach,‡ Worden,§ T. Taylor,‖ and Guild,¶ who belonged to the same school of interpretation, and who nearly all wrote about the end or close of the seventeenth century. Excepting the first two, they do not enter at all into the rationale of the subject, and these two very sparingly. The works are all of a much more popular cast than those of the continental divines last noticed, and rather exhibited by particular examples, than theoretically ex-

* Philologia Sac. Lib. II. P. 1. Tract. II. Sect. IV. Vitringa Obs. Sac. Vol. II. Lib. VI. ch. XX. Witsius de Œconom. Lib. IV. ch. 6.

† The Figures and Types of the Old Testament.

‡ Key to open the Scripture Metaphors and Types.

§ The Types unveiled, or the Gospel picked out of the Legal Ceremonies.

‖ Moses and Aaron. ¶ Moses unveiled.

plained the nature of their views. They agree so far with each other, and with writers of the Cocceian school, that they admit of *inferred*, as well as *innate* types, although some of them manifested much more caution in adopting these than others. Mather in particular, and Worden also, very rarely go beyond the express warrant of Scripture, notwithstanding that they claimed the liberty of doing so, holding the principle, that "where the analogy was evident and manifest between things under the law and things under the gospel, the one were to be concluded to be types of the other." How far this analogy was sometimes carried, we may best learn, perhaps, from Taylor and Guild, who follow much in the same track, and the latter of whom has no fewer than forty-nine typical resemblances between Joseph and Christ, and seventeen between Jacob and Christ, not scrupling to swell the number by taking in acts of sin occasionally, as well as the merest trifles. Thus Jacob's being a supplanter of his brother, is made to represent Christ's supplanting death, sin and Satan; his being obedient to his parents in all things, Christ's subjection to his heavenly Father and his earthly parents; his purchasing the birthright by red pottage, and obtaining the blessing by presenting savoury venison to his father, clothed in Esau's garment, Christ's purchasing the heavenly inheritance to us by his red blood, and obtaining the blessing by offering up the savoury meat of his obedience, in the borrowed garment of our nature, &c.

Now we may say of these, and the similar examples, with which the writings of that school abound, that they all proceed upon the wrong principle, that a resemblance of *any sort*, is sufficient to constitute the relation of type and antitype. And to deal in this arbitrary manner with the word of God, is to caricature, rather than to vindicate, its great theme, and throw it open to every frivolous or extravagant conceit. Let the resemblance between the earlier and the later circumstance be ever so exact, yet if the resemblance is all we have to found upon, who can assure us that there is any thing typical in the matter? any thing more, indeed, than is to be met with in all history, profane as well as sacred? What, for example, might prevent Romulus, assembling a band of desperadoes of every description to found his commonwealth, from serving, as well as David in the situation alluded to above, to typify the procedure of Christ in calling to him publicans and sinners? There is at least as striking a resemblance in the one case as the other, and both stood on precisely the same footing as far as concerns the will and appointment of God; for both alike were the offspring of human policy, struggling against outward difficulties, and endeavouring to supply the want of better resources. And thus, by pushing the matter beyond its just limits, we reduce sacred history in this respect to the level of profane, and at the same time throw an air of uncertainty over the whole aspect of its typical character.

That such a loose and unregulated method of handling the typical matter of ancient Scripture should have given rise to many

trifling and far-fetched analogies, is no more than what might have been expected. It had no fixed rules and clear principles, by which to guide its investigations, at least those it had were so vague and general that they set up no proper land-marks in the field of inquiry, and left every thing connected with the subject in an arbitrary and uncertain state. It was this, perhaps, more than any thing else, which had the effect of bringing typical interpretations into disrepute, and of leading men, in proportion as the exact and critical study of Scripture came to be cultivated, to regard the subject as hopelessly involved in uncertainty and conjecture. This, however, was not the only fault inherent in the typological system, which was adopted by those who belonged to the Cocceian school. It failed even more fundamentally in the idea it conceived of the connexion between the Old and the New Testament dispensations —between the type, and the thing typified,—which was made to consist chiefly in points of mere outward resemblance, to the comparative neglect of the great principles common alike to both dispensations, and which formed the essential link of connexion between them. It was this fundamental error which principally occasioned the many extravagances, that disfigured the typical illustrations of our older divines: it led them to make account of numberless superficial or accidental resemblances; and it further led them to overlook or misapprehend the immediate object and design of the types in their relation to the Old Testament worshippers. For while *as types* they speak a language that can be distinctly and intelligently understood only by us, who are privileged to read their meaning in the gospel antitype, they yet had, *as events or institutions*, a present purpose to accomplish apart altogether from their prospective reference, and as much as if they had possessed no such reference at all.

3. The obvious errors and imperfections of the typological system just described, were not long in leading to its general abandonment, both in this country and on the continent. And it was succeeded by another, which, without entering at all into a more profound investigation of the subject, or explaining more satisfactorily the grounds of a typical connexion between the Old and New Testament dispensations, would admit those, and those only, to be types, which were expressly declared to be such in Scripture itself. This seemed to be the only proper safeguard against error and excess.* And yet, we fear, the evils connected with the for-

* I suppose it is in this way we are to understand the following critique of Buddeus: "It cannot certainly be denied, that the Cocceians, at least some of them, have carried this matter too far. For besides that they *every where* seem to find images and types of future things, where other people can discern none; when they come to make the application to the antitype, they not unfrequently condescend to minute and even trifling things, nay, advance what is utterly insignificant and ludicrous, exposing holy writ to the mockery of the profane. And here it may be proper to notice the fates of exegetical theology, since that intemperate rage for allegories, which appeared in Origen and the fathers, and which has already been condemned by the Schoolmen, was again, after an interval, though under a different form, produced upon the stage. For that typical interpretation differs from the allegorical only in this, that in it respect is had to the future things, which are adum-

mer system were not by any means the only reason for adopting this more circumscribed and meagre one; but that an unhappy current had begun to set in upon the Protestant church, which led men comparatively to lose sight of Christ amid much learning and philosophy, and consequently disposed them to disrelish and repudiate a doctrine, which gloried in finding evidences of Christ throughout the whole of Scripture. It was indeed the redeeming point of the older typological system, which should be allowed to go far in extenuating the occasional errors connected with it, that it supposed Christ and the gospel dispensation to be the grand aim and object of all Scripture. But about the commencement of the eighteenth century, a general coldness began to manifest itself in the writings, as well as the lives of even the more orthodox part of the church. The vital spirit of Christianity, which had been all energy and zeal a century before, had now become dull and languid; faith, the one great well-spring of soundness of doctrine and devotedness of life, was first weakened, and ultimately in many instances supplanted by a worldly philosophizing spirit, which softened down, if it did not entirely renounce, all that was peculiar in the gospel. Under the influence of such a spirit, Christ was not allowed to maintain his proper place in the New Testament, and how much less, then, in the Old?

Vitringa who lived to see the commencement of this deterioration, attributed to it nearly the whole of that distaste, which was then beginning to discover itself to typical interpretations, according to the existing method. With special reference to the famous work of Spencer on the Laws of the Hebrews, a work full indeed of profound learning, but throughout low and carnal in its tone, he deplored the disposition which appeared to seek for the grounds and reasons of the Mosaic institutions, in the mazes of Egyptian idolatry, and not rather to find in them the mystery of Christ, by the Holy Spirit himself plainly declared to be there indicated, and in the institutions themselves so distinctly delineated, that no one could fail to discern the type, who loved the antitype. Nor could he conceal his fear, that the talent, authority, and learning of such men as Spencer, would gain extensive credit for their opinions, and soon bring the typology of Scripture, as he understood it, into contempt.* In that certainly he was not mistaken. Another generation had scarcely passed, when Dathe published the Sacred Philology of Glass, so changed in many respects by the new spirit of rationalism, that Glass himself could scarcely have recognised it as his own; and the section on types, to which we formerly referred, was quietly dropped out altogether, as relating to a subject no longer thought worthy of a recognised place in the science of an enlightened theology. That spirit of rationalism, in the majesty

brated by the types; and so the typical may be considered as a sort of allegorical interpretation. But in either way the amplest scope is afforded for the play of a luxuriant imagination and a fertile mind." I. F. Buddei Isagoge II. Hist. Theolog., published in 1730.

* Obs. Sac. Vol. II. p. 460, 461.

of its antichristian pride, had by this time succeeded in discarding the *innate*, as well as the *inferred* types of the older divines; and the convenient doctrine of *accommodation*, at the same time introduced, provided an easy explanation for those passages of the New Testament, which explicitly asserted such and such things in the Old to have been types of Christ. It was only an adaptation, dictated by Jewish prejudice or conceit, of certain facts and institutions belonging to a former age, beside their original purpose, to the events of the gospel dispensation; and so, Christ and Moses, the shadows of the law, and the substance of the gospel, stood virtually dissevered from each other in the new system of the leading divines on the continent.

In this country, various causes, which we need not at present investigate, contributed to render the downward progress much slower, and also to prevent it from running to the same excess of dishonour to the name of Christ. Even authors of such a cold and philosophizing spirit as Clarke and Jortin, not only wrote in defence of types as having a certain use in revelation, but also admitted more within the circle of types, than those which were expressly named in New Testament scripture.* They certainly urged the necessity of exercising the greatest caution in travelling beyond the plain record of Scripture, and in the whole cast of their thoughts they manifestly belonged much more to the Spencerian, than to the Cocceian school; yet a feeling of the close connexion existing between the Old and the New Testament dispensations, prevented them from rejecting the more important, at least, of the inferred types. And Jortin, especially, falls so much into the current of the older writers, that he reckons up no fewer than forty points, in which Moses as a type resembled Christ. A work, composed much about the same period that Jortin published his first volume of Remarks, and one that has had more influence than any other in forming the general opinion on types in Scotland, the production of a young minister in Dundee, Mr. M'Ewen,† is still more free in the admission of circumstances into the rank of types, which are not expressly characterized as typical in Scripture itself. The work is entirely of a popular cast, contains no investigation of the grounds on which typical interpretations rest, and harmonises much more with the school which had flourished in the previous century, than that to which Clarke and Jortin belonged. As indicative of a particular mode of interpretation, it is precisely similar to the older productions of Mather and Taylor, and partakes alike of their excellencies and their defects.

There was therefore in this country a considerable unwillingness to depart altogether from the principles of the Cocceian school. The declension came in gradually, and in its progress was rather

* Clarke's Evidences, p. 420. Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I. p. 138—152.

† Grace and Truth, or the Glory and Fulness of the Redeemer displayed, in an attempt to explain the Types, Figures, and Allegories of the Old Testament, by the Rev. W. M'Ewen.

marked by the tacit rejection in practice of much that was formerly reckoned typical, than by the introduction of avowedly different opinions on the subject. The spirit which prevailed among the more eminent divines, was one that led them to look more for the reasons of Christianity in the general nature of things, than in any thing which it had in common with the Old Testament religion, and to account for the peculiarities of the latter by its relation to paganism, rather than by tracing its connexion with the coming dispensation of the gospel. As an inevitable consequence, the typological province of theology fell into general neglect. Nay, the Old Testament scriptures at large came to be regarded in an inferior light, and in those parts especially, which relate the history, or describe the worship of the ancient church, they were seldom viewed as containing what could be of much service to the faith and knowledge of those, who live under the gospel. It seems partly, at least, to have been owing to this growing distaste for Old Testament inquiries, and undervaluation of its contents, that what is called the Hutchinsonian school arose in England,—running by a sort of revulsion from the prevailing taste, into the opposite extreme of searching for the elements of all knowledge, human and divine, in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. This school possesses too much the character of an episode in the history of Biblical interpretation in this country, and was itself too much characterized by extravagance, to require any particular description at present. It was, besides, chiefly of a physico-theological character, combining the elements of a natural philosophy with the truths of revelation, and pretending to discover both together in the statements, and words even, of the sacred Scriptures. With this object in view, it of course naturally sought to draw the most profound meanings from the Old Testament writings, in reference to the doctrines of the gospel, as well as to the truths of science. And one of the maxims of the school was, that "every passage in the Old Testament looks backward and forward, and every way, like light from the sun; not only to the state before and under the law, but under the gospel, and nothing is hid from the light thereof."* When such a depth and complexity of meaning was supposed to be involved in every passage, we need not be greatly surprised to learn, not only that the offering of Isaac was a type of the sacrifice of Christ, but that Abraham himself knew from the preceding types and promises, that "one of his own line was to be sacrificed, to be a blessing to all the race of Adam;" and that when he received the command to offer Isaac, he proceeded to obey it, "not doubting that Isaac was to be that person who should redeem man."†

The cabalistic character, and utter extravagance of the Hutchinsonian system, if it had any definite effects at all upon the study of types and other cognate subjects, could only tend to increase the suspicion with which they were already viewed, and

* Hutchinson's Works, vol. I. p. 202. † Ibid. vol. VII. p. 325.

prepare the way for a system, which, however otherwise defective, had at least the advantage of keeping investigation within the bounds of sobriety and caution. Accordingly, while nothing more was done to open up the essential and proper ground of a typical connexion between Old and New Testament things, and to prevent abuse by making the subject in its fundamental principles more thoroughly understood, the more systematic students of the Bible came, by a sort of common consent, to acquiesce in the opinion, that those only were to be reckoned types which Scripture itself affirmed to be so. We may take Bishop Marsh as the ablest expounder of this view of the subject, who says, "There is no other rule, by which we can distinguish a real from a pretended type, than that of Scripture itself. There are no other possible means, by which we can know, that a previous design, and a pre-ordained connexion existed; whatever persons or things, therefore, recorded in the Old Testament, were expressly declared by Christ, or by his apostles, to have been designed as prefigurations of persons or things relating to the New Testament, such persons or things, so recorded in the former, are types of the persons or things with which they are compared in the latter. But if we assert, that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing, where no such prefiguration has been declared by divine authority, we make an assertion, for which we neither have, nor can have, the slightest foundation."* This is certainly a very conclusive mode of settling the matter, but the principle here advocated, though not always so oracularly announced, has long been practically received. It was substantially adopted by Macknight, in his Dissertation on the Interpretation of Scripture at the end of his Commentary on the Epistles, before Marsh wrote, and it has been followed since by Vanmildert and Conybeare in their Bampton Lectures, by Nares in his Warburtonian Lectures, by Chevalier in his Hulsean Lectures, by Horne in his Introduction, and a host of other writers.

Judging from an article in the American Biblical Repository, which appeared in the number for January, 1841, it would appear, that the divines, who are regarded as authorities on the other side of the Atlantic, concur in the same views. The reviewer himself advocates the opinion, that "no person, event or institution, should be regarded as typical, but what may be proved to be such from the Scriptures," that is, by their expressly asserting it in regard to the individual case. And in support of this opinion he quotes, in addition to others, chiefly English authorities, the words of two of his own countrymen, Professor Stowe and Moses Stuart; the latter of whom says, "That just so much of the Old Testament is to be accounted typical, as the New Testament affirms to be so, and *no more*. The fact, that any thing or event under the Old Testament dispensation was designed to prefigure something under the New, can be known to us only by revelation, and of course all

* Lectures, p. 373.

that is not designated by divine authority as typical, can never be made so, by any authority less than that which guided the writers of the New Testament."*

The view embraced by this school of interpreters, lies open to one objection, in common with the school that preceded it. While a certain number of types were admitted, nothing was done to investigate and explain the internal nature of the connexion existing between them, and the corresponding realities under the gospel. There are fewer points of resemblance presented to us in these writers between type and antitype, than in the works of an older date, but the resemblances themselves are just as much of an outward and superficial kind. There is as little to be met with of the rationale or grounds of the doctrine, in the one system as the other. But other defects adhere to the view in question. The leading excellence of the previous system, was the constant reference which it supposed the Old Testament scriptures to bear toward Christ and the gospel dispensation: and the practical disavowal of this may be said to constitute the great defect of the more exact and meagre system, which has now obtained the general suffrage of the learned. It drops a golden principle for the sake of avoiding a few lawless aberrations. It furnishes, indeed, a clear and well-defined rule for our guidance, with which it is scarcely possible to be guilty of extravagance. But it is a rule, which leaves more untaught a great deal than it teaches, and is itself almost a more vicious error than the evils it is applied to correct. For it breaks the link of connexion between the Old and the New Testament scriptures in regard to a large portion of the former,—thus depriving the Christian church of much of the instruction in divine things, which they were designed to impart, and unduly contracting the light which they were intended to shed over the events and dispensation of the gospel. Were men accustomed, as they should be, to search for evidences of Christ in all Scripture, and to regard the inspired records of both covenants as having for their leading object "the testimony of Jesus," they would know how much they were losers by such a curtailment of the typical matter of Scripture. And in proportion as they grow in depth of spiritual discernment and enlarged acquaintance with the truth of God, they will be the less inclined to feel satisfied with such a limited and superficial system.

We must, however, take a closer view of the subject. The rule of interpretation just mentioned is manifestly built on the ground, that nothing less than inspired authority is sufficient to guide us to the discovery and explanation of the types. But why should this be deemed so necessary? No one holds the necessity of inspiration to explain the prophecies, and decide even with certainty upon their fulfilment, and why should it be reckoned absolutely indispensable in the closely related subject of types? This question was long ago asked by Witsius, and we yet see no sufficient reason

* Stuart's Ernesti, p. 13.

for summarily setting it aside. It is universally allowed concerning the prophecies, which refer to Christ and his kingdom, that only a part has been opened up and applied by the pen of inspiration; which, indeed, was so little necessary for the purpose, that even before the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost our Lord reproved his disciples, as "fools and slow of heart to believe *all* that the prophets had spoken." From the analogy subsisting between the two subjects,—for what is type but a prophetical act or institution?—we might reasonably infer the same liberty to have been granted, and the same obligation imposed in regard to the typical parts of ancient Scripture. But we have something more than a mere argument from analogy to guide us to this conclusion; for the very same complaint is brought by an inspired writer against private Christians concerning their slowness in understanding the types, which our Lord brought against his apostles in regard to the prophecies. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, a sharp reproof is administered to the disciples, for their imperfect acquaintance with the typical character of Melchisedec, and subjects of a like nature,*—thus placing it beyond a doubt, that it is both the duty and the privilege of the church, with that measure of the Spirit's aid which it is the part of *every believer* to expect, to inquire into and understand the typical, as well as the prophetical matter of ancient Scripture, whether inspiration may have thrown any special light on it or not. To deny this, is clearly to withhold an important privilege from the Christian church; to dissuade from it, is to encourage the neglect of an incumbent duty.

But the unsoundness of the principle, which would thus limit the number of types to those which are expressly mentioned in New Testament scripture, becomes still more apparent, when we consider what these really are, and in what manner they are introduced. Leaving out of view the tabernacle, its sacred furniture, and the services therewith connected, the typical nature of which has been placed beyond dispute by the Epistle to the Hebrews, the following are all the types, for which any thing like an express warrant of Scripture can be produced: 1. Persons or characters; Adam, (Rom. v. 11, 12, 1 Cor. xv. 22,) Melchisedec, (Heb. vii.) Sarah and Hagar, the latter also identified with Sinai and Jerusalem, (Gal. iv. 22—30,) Ishmael and Isaac, (ibid.) Moses, (Gal. iii. 19, Acts iii. 22—26,) Jonah, (Matth. xii. 40,) David, (Ez. xxxvii. 24, Luke i. 32,) Solomon, (2 Sam. vii.) Zerubbabel and Joshua, (Zech. iii.) 2. Transactions or events; the preservation of Noah and his family in the deluge, (1 Pet. iii. 20,) the exodus, (Matth. ii. 15,) the passage through the Red Sea, the giving of manna, the putting of a vail on the face of Moses while the law was read, the rock that was smitten and the serpent that was lifted up in the wilderness, with some judgments also that were inflicted on the Israelites in the wilderness, (1 Cor. x., John iii. 14, 15, v. 33.)†

* Heb. v. 11—14.

† In the above list every type is given, for which any show of an express warrant in Scripture can be produced. Certain passages no doubt have been tortured so as

Now let any person of candour and intelligence take his Bible, and examine the passages to which reference has just been made, and let him say, whether the manner in which these typical characters and things are there introduced, is such as to indicate, that these alone were prefigurative of similar characters and things under the gospel—that in naming them, in short, the inspired writers had exhausted the typical bearing of Old Testament history? On the contrary, it seems impossible to avoid the conviction, that in adducing these particular examples, they were merely singling out a few as occasion required from a vast storehouse, where many similar ones were to be found. They have all the appearance, at least, of having been selected only as examples suited to the immediate purpose in view, and are consequently to be taken for mere specimens of the class to which they belong. And this being the case, they should rather have the effect of prompting farther inquiry than of checking it—so far from themselves comprehending and bounding the whole field of typical matter, they may rather be regarded as furnishing the data, from which we are to gather the rules that ought to guide us in our search for others of a like description.

Indeed, were it otherwise, nothing could be more arbitrary and unmeaning as the typology of Scripture. For what is there to distinguish the characters and events, which Scripture has thus particularized, from a great multitude of others in sacred history, so that they alone should have been invested with a typical meaning? Is there any thing on the face of the inspired record to make us look upon *them* in a singular light, as carrying an aspect to future times, which none besides might possess? So much the reverse, that it is scarcely possible to avoid the conviction, that if those were typical, so also must many others, which hold not a less, but even sometimes a more prominent place in the page of sacred history. Can it be seriously believed, that Sarah and Hagar were raised up as typical characters to teach important lessons to future times concerning the dispensation of the gospel, while there was nothing properly typical in Abraham, from whom, notwithstanding, they derived their whole importance, their very existence even, as

to afford some colour for introducing more. For example, the mention in Gen. xlix. 24, of "the shepherd, the stone of Israel," has been sometimes taken as a Scripture warrant for making Joseph a typical character; John viii. 56, for having Abraham, and Matth. ii. 23, coupled with Judges xiii. 5, for having Samson placed in the same rank. No one scarcely will stand up for such interpretations of Scripture in the present day. Even what is said in Mal. iv. 5, of the sending of Elias, cannot with any propriety be regarded as Scripture authority for making him the type of John; for the proper name is evidently used metaphorically to describe the peculiar cast of character which distinguished Elias as a prophet. It is also to be remarked, that some even of those which are included in the above list, have after all but slender authority, so far as the express testimony of Scripture is concerned, for being reckoned types. Those of Solomon, Jonah, and the lifting up of the serpent, are particularly doubtful, as the Scriptures, which refer to them, admit of being explained, and are explained by many recent interpreters, without implying so much as that these were really types of Christ. We have inserted them, however, lest we should be thought by some to have unduly curtailed the number of Scriptural types, as the conclusion we draw from them depends in great measure on their fewness.

scriptural characters? What reason can we imagine for Melchisedec and Jonah having been constituted types—persons to whom our attention is comparatively little drawn in Old Testament history—while such leading characters as Joseph, Samson, Elijah, are excluded? Or for selecting the passage through the Red Sea, and the incidents in the wilderness, while the passage through Jordan and the conquest at Canaan are thrown out of view?

It is scarcely possible to conceive a mode of interpretation, which should deal more capriciously with the word of God, and make so anomalous a use of its historical facts. Instead of clothing these with a uniform and consistent language, it singles out only a few examples, and without any reason shown or conceivable for the preference, sets them up by themselves in solitary grandeur, like mystic symbols in a temple, invested with an air of sacredness and importance peculiar only to themselves. The exploded principle, which sought a type in *every* notice of Old Testament history, had at least the merit of uniformity to recommend it, and could not be said to deal partially, however often it might deal unwarrantably with the facts of ancient Scripture; but according to the method, now under review, for which the authority of inspiration itself is claimed, we perceive nothing but arbitrary distinctions and groundless preferences. And though unquestionably it were wrong to expect in the word of God the precise and methodical uniformity, which might naturally have been looked for in a human composition, yet as the product, amid all its variety, of one and the same Spirit, we *are* warranted to expect that there shall be an orderly and consistent agreement among its several parts, and that distinctions shall not be created in the one Testament, which in the other seem destitute of any just foundation or apparent reason.

But then, if a greater latitude is allowed, how shall we guard against error and extravagance? Without the express authority of Scripture, how shall we be able to distinguish between a happy illustration and a real type? In the words of Bishop Marsh, "By what means shall we determine, in any given instance, that what is *alleged* as a type was really *designed* for a type? The only possible source of information on this subject is Scripture itself. The only possible means of knowing that two distant, though similar historical facts, were so connected in the general scheme of divine providence, that the one was designed to prefigure the other, is the authority of that work in which the scheme of divine providence is unfolded."* This is an objection, indeed, which strikes at the root of the whole matter, and its validity can only be ascertained by what can scarcely be said to have yet been done by any writer of this country—a careful investigation into the nature, design, and properties of a type. That Scripture is the sole rule, on the authority of which we are to distinguish what is properly typical from what is not, we readily grant—though not in the straitened

* Lectures, p. 372.

sense contended for by Bishop Marsh and those who hold similar views, as if there were no way for Scripture to bear with any effect upon the subject, except by naming every individual case. It is possible, surely, that in this, as well as in other things, Scripture may furnish us with certain views or principles, the special and particular application of which is left very much to ourselves. Not only may we regard this as possible, but judging from analogy, we may even look upon it as highly probable—it being one of the leading peculiarities of New Testament scripture, that it rather unfolds great principles, than dwells on minute and isolated facts. It is presumption against, not in favour of, the system we now oppose, that it shuts up the typology of Scripture, in so far as connected with the characters and events of sacred history, within the narrow circle of a few scattered and apparently random examples. Whether we may succeed or not in satisfactorily establishing a better system, the attempt to do so cannot be charged with aiming at what is in itself improbable, and may at least be of service in drawing the attention of Christians to the unity of design which pervades the Old and the New Testament scriptures, the traces they exhibit of the same divine hand, the subservience of the one to the other, and the important ends which the things occurring under the earlier dispensations of God are still intended to fulfil in behalf of those "on whom the ends of the world are come."

This introductory chapter, and the whole indeed of the first part, were, as to their substance, drawn up several years ago, and have only now been cast into a more correct order and a more extended form. A new style of treating the symbols of the Old Testament has meanwhile been springing up in Germany, and may be said to be laying the foundation of a new school of typology. Various writers there had, from the beginning of the present century, applied themselves to the investigation of the symbolical character of the religions of antiquity. This line of investigation was at first prosecuted much as a subject of antiquarian and philosophical research, and Judaism was thought too unimportant, in this point of view, to have any particular notice taken of it. However, a better spirit was at the same time beginning to develope itself in regard to the religion of the Bible; and this, combined with the taste for symbolical inquiries, has ultimately led to the minute investigation of the symbolical character of the Mosaic institutions. It has been treated at great length by Baehr, in his Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus, (published in 1837-9,) and more briefly by Hengstenberg, in his Authentic des Pentateuchus, the second volume of which, the only one that bears on the subject, was published in 1839. Tholuck also, in his Commentary on the Hebrews, has followed in the same course, adopting the views of Hengstenberg in so far as they differ from those of Baehr. Even De Wette, whose earlier productions seem to have had it as one of their chief objects to depreciate Christianity by discovering in it as many marks as possible of Judaizing weakness and bigotry, appears in his declining

years to have caught somewhat of this better spirit, and to have turned his thoughts to the nobler object of elevating Judaism by descrying in its institutions and services the traces of Christianity. In a passage quoted by Baehr, he says: "Christianity sprung out of Judaism. Long before Christ appeared, the world was prepared, in which he was to appear; *the entire Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of him who was to come, and has come.* Who can deny, that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent of Christ long before he came, and in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less clear, descried the new doctrine? And the typological comparison of the New, with the Old Testament, was by no means a mere play of fancy. Christianity lay in Judaism as leaves and fruit do in the seed, although it certainly requires the divine sun to bring them forth."

Language such as this, and from such a quarter, undoubtedly indicates a great change of sentiment. An immense progress has been made in understanding the connexion between the writings of the two covenants; and instead of seeking to explain away the peculiarities of the gospel by resolving them into this and that Jewish prejudice, the more scriptural and rational method has been adopted of taking the gospel as the finished revelation, and by the help of its clearer light reading the peculiarities of Judaism. What has been done as yet, however, is rather the laying of a foundation for a new system of typology, than such a system itself. The language of De Wette is of a sufficiently wide and comprehensive character, but in point of fact, much that is admitted in the general by writers of his class, is practically denied when you come to the particular details. Baehr certainly is not chargeable with the same fault, but rather runs into the opposite one, of descending into too many particulars. But it is simply the symbolical nature of the Jewish ritual, which he investigates, and which properly forms the ground-work only of its typical character, although it is impossible to handle the one without making many allusions to the other. The one, however, may be handled in the most complete and satisfactory manner, while points of great interest and importance respecting the other are left untouched. And that is the case with the writers above noticed. They neither profess to open up in its entire compass the typical bearing of the Old Testament scriptures, nor have they in point of fact done so. Their investigations are valuable, so far as they go; but they have not yet gone, I conceive, to the full extent which Scripture itself warrants, nor have they touched upon various topics, to which the views they have expressed might have been legitimately and happily applied. It may not be fair, perhaps, to hold them as conclusively rejecting all the *historical* matters of ancient Scripture from the region of types, as the works in question did not lead them to pronounce any determinate judgment regarding it. But we certainly cannot refer to their authority for holding any thing to be typical out of the range of the Mosaic ritual, and it seems as if they scarcely contemplated the application of their principles to

the historical transactions of the Old Testament. In this, we must not be understood as including either Olshausen or Hengstenberg.

The view adopted by Olshausen, who alone has endeavoured to found what may be called a new system of typology, we cannot give better than in the brief outline of Klausen: "We must distinguish between a false and a genuine allegorical exposition, which latter, though it alone, has the support of the highest authority, being frequently employed by the inspired writers of the New Testament. The fundamental error in the common allegorizing, from which all its arbitrariness has sprung, bidding defiance to every sound principle of exposition, must be sought in this, that a double sense has been attributed to Scripture, one of them consequently a sense entirely different from that which is indicated by the words. Accordingly, the characteristic of the genuine allegorical exposition must be, its recognising no sense besides the literal one, differing from this in nature as from the historical reality of what is recorded, but only a deeper-lying sense (ὑπονοια,) bound up with the literal meaning by an internal and essential connexion, given in and with this; which, therefore, must needs present itself whenever the subject is considered from the higher point of view, and which is capable of being ascertained by fixed rules. Hence, if the question be regarding the fundamental principles, according to which the connexion must be made out between the deeper apprehension and the immediate sense conveyed by the words, these have their foundation in the law of general harmony, by which all individuals, in the natural as well as in the spiritual world, form *one* great organic system,—by which all phenomena, whether belonging to a higher or to a lower sphere, appear as impressions of the nature of ideas, so that the whole is represented in the individual, and the individual again in the whole. This mysterious relation comes most prominently out in the history of the Jewish people and their worship; but something analogous every where discovers itself, and in the manner in which the Old Testament is expounded in the New, are we furnished with the rules for all exposition of the word, of nature, and of history. For example, in the relation of Israel to Jehovah, we have the image of humanity at large and of every individual, standing in a religious relation to him; in the relation of Israel to other nations, the image of the opposition existing every where and in all times between godliness and its persecutors; Israel, the chosen people, the nation of priests, is further the type of Jesus as the anointed of the Lord, the eternal high priest; and finally, all holy combatants for the truth, all individuals wrestling for holiness, are again so many images of the people of Israel, and therefore also of the only-begotten Son of God."*

In this mode of viewing the typical matter of ancient Scripture, there is a substantial exhibition of the truth, and it differs from that unfolded in the following pages more perhaps in form, than

* Klausen Hermeneutik, pp. 334, 335.

in substance. But presented as it is, under the form of a *kind* of allegorizing, proceeding on the principle of a higher and lower sense being contained in each part of Scripture, it certainly exhibits the truth under an unhappy form, and is open to some of the objections and abuses of the ancient allegorizing. "The allegorizing," as Klausen has remarked, "may perhaps be applied with greater moderation and better taste than formerly; but against the old principle, though revived as often as put down, viz. that every sense, which can be found in the words, has a right to be regarded as the sense of the words, the same exceptions will always be taken." If the typology of Scripture cannot be rescued from the domain of allegorizings, it will be impossible to give it a solid and substantial footing. And it will be observed, that though in the following pages there may be often practically no substantial difference between the light we derive from Old Testament scripture, and that exhibited by Olshausen, yet we have no more to do with a nearer and deeper, than with a double, sense of Scripture.

Klausen himself has no place in his hermeneutics for typical, as distinguished from allegorical interpretations. He seems to consider, as undoubtedly the most of the continental hermeneutical writers do, these as substantially the same in kind, and the latter only as the excess of the former. He admits the propriety, but only in a sort of apologetical and doctrinal way, not as having any thing to do with the work of exposition, properly so called, of making *some* application of Old Testament Scripture to the realities of the gospel, because of the relation which the one is asserted by inspired writers to hold to the other; although he conceives such relation scarcely to admit of being brought to the test of historical truth, and the examples furnished of it in the New Testament to have arisen from necessity, rather than from choice, and commendable chiefly for their paucity, (pp. 95, 96.) Dr. Davidson, in his lately published work on Hermeneutics, differs so far from Klausen, that he distinguishes between allegorical and typical interpretations of Scripture, holding the one to be warranted, and the other not,—but, at the same time, draws no essential lines of distinction between them, nay, substantially confounds them together, because identifying them with "secondary or spiritual interpretations." He consequently regards what is usually understood by allegorical interpretations, as not different in nature from typical ones, but only "an excessive use of the true spiritual interpretation contained in the New Testament," (pp. 68, 69.)

The only other work of recent publication, to which we shall advert, is that of Mr. Alexander.* The portion devoted to the examination of the typology of ancient Scripture, is very limited, —much more limited, I conceive, than its important bearing on the connexion between the two economies properly entitles it to occupy in works purposely intended to trace that connexion. In

* The Connexion and Harmony of the Old and New Testament, by W. L. Alexander, M.A.

the short space allotted to the subject, there are some excellent remarks and just distinctions, expressing substantially the leading views of Baehr; but, we regret to say, these are applied to the utter exclusion of the historical types. The author admits nothing as typical which does not possess the character of a divine institution. He thus confines the types almost exclusively to the rites and services of the Old Testament worship; and not only cuts off all the *inferred* types of the Cocceian school, but also a large proportion of what used to be regarded as *innate* ones. Such transactions as those of the brazen serpent, and what befell to Jonah, and the events which happened to Israel in the wilderness, are held by him to have been referred to as mere comparisons, and the use made of them in the New Testament, is characterized as a simple allegorizing, or ascribing to them a fictitious meaning for the sake of illustration. Nothing in short is typical, but "symbolical institutes expressly appointed by God to prefigure to those, among whom they were set up, certain great transactions in connexion with that plan of redemption, which in the fulness of time was to be unfolded to mankind."

I shall not repeat what was said near the commencement of this chapter about allegorical or fictitious meanings, and in vindication of the apostle Paul from the use of them, in the sense now meant. But if in such passages, as those in Galatians and 1 Corinthians, the apostle puts fictitious meanings on certain transactions of Old Testament history, "for illustration merely, and not for the purpose of building any thing on them," how, we ask, could he, with any fairness or propriety, have introduced the most important of these fictitious meanings, with a solemn appeal to the Galatians, calling upon them "to hear the law?" Could he have honestly used such an expression in reference to a mere play of fancy on a piece of ancient history, which might readily have been flung back upon him as a groundless conceit? On the contrary, it is a summons to hear the authoritative word of God; and if the word produced were nothing, after all, but a fictitious meaning put on a past transaction, I cannot see how the apostle can be acquitted of dealing deceitfully with the oracles of God.—Then, again, if all historical events be excluded, whether of a more common, or of a more extraordinary and peculiar nature, of course the deluge falls among the rest, while yet we are expressly told by Peter, that baptism is the antitype of it, or, in other words, that the deluge was the type of baptism.—A theory, which has to do violence to such plain testimonies of Scripture, cannot be based on a sound foundation; it plainly does not account for all the facts of the case; and if admitted, would infallibly lead to most unwarrantable liberties being taken with the inspired record.

A special exception is taken by Mr. Alexander against the case of Jonah, and which he seems to think conclusively settles a charge of absurdity on the supposition of its typical character. "A type," he says, "is an acted lesson,—a visible representation of invisible truths. To its utility, therefore, spectators are as indispensable

as actors; and where the former are not present, to say that God appoints the latter to go through their performance, is to charge him with doing something in vain." But there were no spectators to witness the descent of Jonah into the whale's belly, and his subsequent escape, and consequently, there could be nothing typical in the matter. But if we are entitled to argue thus in the case of Jonah, why should we not also do it in regard to the high-priest himself on the great day of atonement? Who witnessed his entrance with the blood of sprinkling into the most holy place? Not an eye-witness was permitted to be present, or a human being besides himself to stand within the sanctuary. And thus the chief of all symbolical transactions under the old covenant, was of necessity as secret and unobserved, as the portions in question of Jonah's history; and if there being only a *description*, and not an *actual exhibition* of what took place, is a fatal objection in the one case, it will be difficult to show how it can be less so in the other. "The record that a type was enacted, is no more the enacting of a type, than the history of a battle is a battle." Be it so,—then the high priest coming forth and telling the people, that he had gone with blood into the most holy place, was no more the enacting of a type, than an individual giving an account of a battle would have been a battle. All such objections proceed, I apprehend, upon a partial and defective view of the subject, and can only be satisfactorily removed by a full and lengthened investigation into its grounds and principles. This is what has been attempted, at least, in the following pages, and to these we must now refer.

CHAPTER II.

THE EXACT NATURE, USE, AND DESIGN OF TYPES, CONSIDERED WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO WHAT ARE COMMONLY CALLED RITUAL TYPES, OR THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS OF MOSES.

THE proper method, it may be thought, of entering on the formal investigation of the typology of Scripture, would be by giving the definition of a type in terms at once sufficiently exact and comprehensive to describe its real nature, and express precisely what we understand by it. There might be some difficulty, however, in doing this, so as to bring fully out our conception of the subject, without either leaving room to doubt the correctness of our definition, or fatiguing the attention by lengthened explanations. There are two leading ideas involved in most, if not all of the definitions commonly adopted, which may be said to embody the general characteristics of the subject, and which comprise all that is necessary to be laid as a groundwork for pursuing its further investigation. Understanding the word *type* in the theological sense,—for,

as employed in Scripture, it is used with greater latitude, as may be seen by consulting in the original, the passages referred to below,*—it is admitted by common consent, first, that in the character, action, or institution, which is denominated the *type*, there must be a resemblance of some kind to what corresponds to it under the gospel; and, second, that the former must not be *any* character, action, or institution, occurring in Old Testament scripture, but such only as had their ordination from God, and were designed by him to foreshadow the gospel antitype. These two conditions enter as essential elements into the constitution of a type, and must meet together in every thing to which the name can with truth and justice be applied. For, as Bishop Marsh has justly remarked, "to constitute one thing the type of another, something more is wanted than mere resemblance. The former must not only resemble the latter, but must have been *designed* to resemble the latter. It must have been so designed in its original institution. It must have been designed as something preparatory to the latter. The type as well as the antitype must have been pre-ordained; and they must have been pre-ordained as constituent parts of the same general scheme of divine providence. It is this *previous design*, and this *pre-ordained connexion*, which constitute the relation of type and antitype.†

The existence, then, of such a relation, evidently pre-supposes and implies two important facts, viz. that the things of the gospel, which constitute the antitypes, are the great objects on which the mind of God was from the first directed for the good of his church; and that, to prepare the way for the introduction of these grand and ultimate objects, he placed the church under a course of training, which included among other things instruction by types, or designed and fitting resemblances of what was to come. Both of these facts are so plainly declared in the word of God, and so universally admitted, that there can be no need for doing more than simply referring to the scriptural proof of them. In respect to the former, the times of the gospel are called "the ends of the world," without which all its preceding parts were imperfect, and "the dispensation of the fulness of times," implying that under it alone were the great objects of faith and hope properly realized.‡ It is only with its commencement also, we are told, that the clear light began to shine upon the church, and that the long-concealed mystery of God was made manifest, the things which concerned the work of salvation having been hitherto wrapped in comparative darkness, and scarcely so much as entering into the imaginations of men in their proper greatness and magnitude.§ Hence the most important and precious ordinances before the coming of Christ, were only as shadows of the sublime and living realities presented in the gospel;‖ and the most eminent in spiritual light

* Heb. viii. 5, 1 Cor. x. 6, Phil. iii. 17, 1 Thess. i. 7, 1 Pet. v. 3, Rom. vi. 17.
† Marsh's Lectures, p. 371. ‡ 1 Cor. x. 11, Heb. xv. 40, Eph. i. 10.
§ 1 John ii. 8, Rom. xvi. 25, 26, Col. i. 27, 1 Cor. ii. 7—10.
‖ Col. ii. 17, Heb. viii. 5.

and privilege before, were inferior to the comparatively little and less distinguished members of the Messiah's kingdom.* The Messiah himself is the beginning and the end, the heart and centre, of the whole scheme of God for the salvation of man; the glorious object for whose coming every true child of God waited and longed, to whose person, work, and kingdom all the prophets gave witness, and on the ground of whose prevailing mediation, foreseen and calculated on, all forgiveness of sin and gifts of grace had from the first proceeded.† In Christ, therefore, and the things of his salvation, every principle and purpose of the divine mind respecting the people of God terminates and is made perfect; these may be said to be the highest, and, indeed, the *only* good for sinful men, because on them, from first to last, every thing is made to depend; and as all that concerns a fallen world dates from the fatal transgression of Adam, so all that concerns a restored world has at once its rise and its consummation in the perfect work of Christ, the second Adam.

The other fact, which is pre-supposed and implied in the doctrine of types, viz. that God subjected the church to a course of preparatory training before he introduced the realities of his final dispensation, stands out with equal clearness and prominence in the page of inspiration. It is scarcely possible, indeed, to separate even in idea the one fact from the other; for without such a course of preparation being meanwhile in progress, the long delay which took place in the bringing in of redemption, and its paramount objects, would be utterly inexplicable. Accordingly, the church of the Old Testament is constantly represented as in a state of comparative childhood, supplied with such measures of instruction and such means of discipline as were suited to its imperfect condition; its law a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, and its prophetical scriptures ever opening out in gradual and growing developments the testimony of Heaven concerning him. Up till the coming of Christ the church was in a state of minority, passing through successive stages of advancement, and in them all undergoing preparation for the glorious light and liberties which were to distinguish its condition when arrived at the season of manhood.‡

In this course of preparation, continuing through so many ages, it is not necessary to suppose, that every thing in the method of instruction and training pursued must have been employed merely with a view to those who lived during its continuance. It must, indeed, have been wisely adapted in all its parts to their peculiar circumstances, and fitted to prepare the church as a whole for the dispensation of the fulness of times; but still, like the instruction and training of a well-taught youth, not more suited to promote

* Matth. xi. 11, where John the Baptist, after being declared greater than all who had gone before him, is yet stated to be less,—not indeed than *the least*, as it is improperly rendered in our version and generally understood, but, as Hengstenberg (Christol. p. iii.) has shown, than the lesser, the comparatively little (μικροτεροι) in the kingdom of heaven—its less distinguished members.

† Rev. i. 8, Luke ii. 25, Acts x. 43, iv. 12, Rom. iii. 25, 1 Pet. i. 20, Rev. xiii. 8.

‡ Gal. iii. 24, iv. 1—3, Heb. viii. 7—13, etc.

the cultivation and improvement of his powers during his minority, than fitted to secure their healthful and profitable exercise throughout the remainder of his earthly existence. As the full-grown man, when pursuing the tenor of his way through the perplexing snares and busy avocations of life, reaps every day the benefit of his early culture, so doubtless was it the intention of God, that the measures adopted with the ancient church should not only minister to the growing light and comfort of its own members, but also furnish materials of consolation, guidance and improvement to the church of the New Testament. If the earlier could not be made perfect without the things belonging to the later church, so neither, on the other hand, can the later safely dispense with the advantages to be derived from an acquaintance with what was done for the immediate behoof of the earlier. The church, considered as God's nursery for training souls to a meetness for immortal life and blessedness, is substantially one through all periods of its existence, and the things which were appointed for its life and well-being in former ages, happened also for the learning of those on whom the ends of the world are come.

Now, in this course of preparation for the realities of Christ's kingdom, the types held an important, though not the only place. The church from the first enjoyed the advantage of direct instruction, communicated either personally by God, or by the instrumentality of his appointed messengers; and in so far as the spirit of prophecy mingled with these communications, as its great theme was the testimony of Jesus, so its leading object and design could not fail to be, the preparation of the church for the reception of his work, and the institution of his kingdom. But whatever was effected in this way, it did not, as we may judge from the course actually pursued, supersede the necessity of types; for these also entered as an essential and important part in the course of preparation. In this respect they possessed so much in common with the intimations of prophecy, that there was a real pre-ordained connexion between them and the things of Christ's kingdom; it was to these they pointed as the ultimate end and reason of their institution. But they differed, inasmuch as they spake of the things of the kingdom, not by words, but by outward palpable resemblances; they stood for the time being in the room of the facts and realities of the gospel, and by certain resemblances, which they bore to these, were designed and fitted to prepare the way for their introduction. And if we inquire concerning these resemblances, of what kind or nature they behooved to be, and actually were, a very little reflection must convince us, that they must somehow have exhibited the same great elements of truth with the things they represented, and that too in a form more level to the comprehension, more easily and distinctly cognizable by the minds of men.

There must have been, first of all, the same great elements of truth,—for the mind of God, and the circumstances of the fallen creature, are substantially the same at all times. What the spi-

ritual necessities of men now are, they have been from the time that sin entered into the world. Hence the truth revealed by God to meet these necessities, however varying from time to time in the precise amount of its communications, and however differing as to the hue and form in which it might be presented, must have been, so far as disclosed, essentially one in every age. For otherwise, what strange and monstrous results would follow? If the principles on which God acted toward men, and regulated his intercourse with them, were materially different at one period from what they were at another, then either the wants and necessities of men's natural condition must not be now what they once were, or the character of God must be susceptible of change—he cannot be the immutable Jehovah. Besides, the very idea of a course of preparatory dispensations, were, on the supposition in question, manifestly excluded; for that could have no proper ground to rest on, unless there was a deep-rooted and fundamental agreement between what was temporary, and what was final and ultimate in the case. The primary and essential elements of truth, therefore, which are embodied in the facts of the gospel, and on which its economy of grace is based, cannot in the nature of things be of recent origin, as if they were altogether peculiar to the New Testament dispensation, and had only begun with its introduction to obtain a place in the government of God. On the contrary, their presence must have formed the groundwork, and their varied manifestation the progress of any preparatory dispensations that existed. And whatever resemblances the typical characters, actions, or institutions of those earlier dispensations might be designed to bear to the grand and ultimate objects of the gospel, their chief use and value must have consisted in the representation they afforded of the vital and fundamental truths, common alike to all dispensations.

If a clear and undoubted certainty attaches to this part of our statement, it does so with still more obvious and self-evident conclusiveness in regard to the other. For if the same great elements of truth must of necessity pervade both type and antitype, they must be found in the former more simply and palpably exhibited,—presented in some shape, in which the human mind could more easily and distinctly recognise them, than in the latter. It were manifestly absurd to admit in a course of preparation for the realities of the gospel, certain resemblances of these, or rather objects having inwrought into them, and reflected from them the same great lines and elements of truth, unless the preparatory had been of more obvious meaning, and of more easy comprehension, than the ultimate and final. The passing away of the one into the other, must undoubtedly have involved a rise in the exhibition of the truth from a lower to a higher territory,—from a form of development more readily grasped, to a form which should put the faculties of the mind to a greater stretch. For thus only could it be wise or proper to set up preparatory dispensations at all, which had been better spared if the objects themselves lay more, or even

so much within the reach and comprehension of the mind, as their temporary and imperfect resemblances.

In what then, precisely, did these resemblances consist? And how, as parts of a preparatory scheme for something higher, did they serve the purpose for which they were appointed? We shall best answer these questions by considering them, in the first instance, exclusively in reference to the symbolical institutions of the Mosaic dispensation, and which are usually denominated the *ritual* or *legal* types. That these institutions possessed a typical character, is so plainly asserted in New Testament scripture, that no believer in inspiration can cherish a single doubt concerning it; and we are also furnished with explanations concerning some of them, which may enable us, with the sure guidance and direction of Heaven, not only to understand their real nature and proper bearing, but also to unravel the intricacies of the whole typological system.

In so far as the institutions of the Mosaic dispensation were typical, they carried a reference, of course, to the dispensation of the gospel,—they were prophetic symbols of the better things to come. But this evidently presupposes and implies, that in another and more immediate respect, they were symbols, forming, as they did, the component parts of an existing worship. They were simply in their own nature, *religious* symbols, that is, outward representations of divine truths, belonging to the religion with which they were connected, and only from being this could they become, in their prospective reference, *prophetic* symbols of what was afterwards to appear in the gospel,—serving the double purpose for the reason already stated, viz., because the preparatory dispensation, to which they belonged, and just because of its being preparatory, was necessarily inwrought with the same great elements of truth, which were afterwards in another form to pervade the Christian. If the Mosaic institutions had merely been representations of the *objects* of the gospel, having no other use and design than to present these to the mind, with what propriety could they have been made the substance of a preparatory dispensation? A partial exhibition of a truth, or an embodiment of it in things comparatively little, and easily grasped by the eye of the mind, may certainly prepare the way for its fuller exhibition or its development in regard to things of a nobler and higher kind; but a lame and imperfect representation of an object, instead of preparing the way for its unveiled appearance, will rather tend to fill the apprehension with mistaken and prejudiced notions of the reality. If such a representation of the objects of the gospel had been all that was aimed at by the symbolical institutions of Moses, then the preparatory dispensation must have been far more difficult for the worshipper, than the ultimate one; the child must have had a much harder lesson to read, and a much higher task to accomplish, than the man of full-grown and ripened intellect; and divine wisdom must have employed its resources, not to smooth the church's path to an enlightened view, and a believing reception of

the realities of the gospel, but to shroud it in the most profound and perplexing obscurities.

No intelligent believer can imagine this to have been the case; and the only possible way in which he can escape from it, is in the conviction, that the institutions of Moses were not merely representations of the objects of the gospel, but first of all in their own nature, and as parts of an existing worship, religious symbols, expressive of certain great and fundamental truths, which were even then understood and acted upon. This is what may be called their primary and immediate object; and to understand distinctly how, or in what respects, they at the same time bore another, and prospective reference to the future realities of the gospel, or how the one, as types, presented to the eye of faith resemblances of the things typified, we must first of all inquire and ascertain, what, in the former point of view, was the native religious import of each symbol? what truths it symbolized to him, who looked to it simply as a part of the existing religion? and hence learn its import and use as part of a preparatory dispensation, intended to issue in the events and glories of Messiah's kingdom. This—which it was the practice of the older typological writers almost entirely to overlook, as if the ritual services of the ancient economy had no use or meaning apart from the better things to come,—this is in truth the foundation of the whole matter; and to overlook or disregard it, is to leave out the most essential elements of the subject, and of necessity to substitute in their room, superficial and often fanciful analogies. The Mosaic ritual, like every other form of religion, had a shell and a kernel,—its shell, the outward rites and observances which it enjoined, its kernel, the spiritual relations which these implied, and the spiritual truths which they embodied and expressed. Substantially, these truths and relations were, and must have been, the same for the Jew, that they are for the Christian; for the wants and necessities of the worshipper under both dispensations are the same, and so also is the character of the God with whom they have to do. *There*, therefore, in that fundamental, internal harmony and agreement, we are to seek for the resemblance, which constituted the relation between type and antitype. So that the symbolical institutions of Moses shall appear, when properly understood, as manifestations of Christ's truth in a lower and earlier stage of existence,—the curiously wrought bud, which contained within its sacred folds every essential principle and relation, that was afterwards to expand, in the work and kingdom of Christ, into full blossom and fruitfulness.

This will be better understood by the illustration of a particular example, which we shall take from what entered into the very core of the Mosaic system,—the rite of expiatory sacrifice. That this was typical, or prophetically symbolical of the death of Christ, as Scripture in many places declares, did not destroy its significance as part of the worship then required by God of his people, or render it by any means a dead service to one, who might be entirely ignorant, or very imperfectly aware of its having any such respect

to a dying Saviour. It was in its own nature a symbolical act, purporting that his sins being transferred to the head of the victim, the life of the one was given up as a substitution for that of the other.* The pouring out of the blood, in which was the life of the offered victim, symbolized the pouring out of the life of the worshipper, or the rendering of it back, as of a thing forfeited, to the God who gave it; and on this surrender of the life, thus symbolically represented, depended the re-establishment of the worshipper in that friendly relation to God, which had been subverted by sin. This is the fundamental principle, the ground-idea, which lay at the root, and constituted the real essence of expiatory sacrifice,—an idea, which is peculiar to no one dispensation in particular, but common to true religion in all ages. And when, from thus viewing the rite of expiatory sacrifice as simply symbolical, we proceed to speak of it as prophetically symbolical of the death of Christ, we are not to be understood as ascribing to it another sense or meaning, but only as affirming, that the capital idea of which it was by itself, and in its own nature, symbolical, was, and only could be properly realized in the one offering of Christ for sin upon the cross. For in him alone was there a real transference of man's guilt to one able and willing to bear it, and in his death, the giving up of a life infinitely dear and precious; hence, there alone can we find the idea of a true, sufficient, and perfect sacrifice, converted into a living reality, on the appearance of which all its inferior and imperfect exhibitions vanish of themselves. Thus, we see it was one and the same great truth, which was embodied in the ever recurring sacrifices of the Old Testament, and the one perfect sacrifice of the New; only, what the former represented in the symbol, the latter possesses in the reality; what the one had no other way of exhibiting, but by the offering up of irrational victims for the purifying of the flesh, the other presents to our view as made good in the purging of the soul, the real seat of defilement, from all sin, by the offering up once for all of the immaculate and precious Lamb of God.

That this account of the nature of the ritual types, or prophetic symbols of the Old Testament, and this mode of investigating them, is the sound and scriptural, as well as the only satisfactory one, will appear by a brief consideration of the language that is used concerning them by the inspired writers of the New Testament. In several passages, they are represented as having been all *shadows* of gospel things; as in Heb. x., where the law is said to have had, "not the perfect image, but the shadow of good things to come;" in chap. viii. 5, where the priests are described as "serving unto the example (copy) and shadow of heavenly things;" and again in Col. ii. 16, where the fleshly ordinances in one mass are declared to be "shadows of good things to come," while it is added, "the body is of Christ." Now, that the tabernacle, with the rites and services connected with it, were shadows of Christ,

* See Outram de Sac. Lib. I. c. XXI., and Magee on the Atonement.

and of the divine realities of his kingdom, can only mean, that they were obscure and imperfect resemblances of the latter,—presenting the same outlines of divine truth, but wanting the great substance or reality, in which these were to find their due manifestation, and fitting development. And when we come to inquire in what the obscurity and imperfection consisted, we find it uniformly stated to have arisen from the carnal and earthly nature of the typical. The tabernacle itself was a material frame-work, constructed, though of rich and costly, yet still of gross and corruptible things; whereas the things, after the pattern of which it was formed, are imperishable and divine. So also, the endless round of services belonging to it, had respect only to the body, being done, primarily and ostensibly at least, for its purification from uncleanness and deliverance from evil;* whereas the things corresponding to them under the gospel are all spiritual, and issue in the inheritance of a life that cannot die. In these differences, which are such as must ever subsist between flesh and spirit, corruption and incorruption, time and eternity, we perceive the darkness and imperfection, which hung around the things of the former dispensation, as shadows of those which were to come. But still shadows are resemblances. Though unlike in one respect, they must be like in another; and as the unlikeness stood in the dissimilar nature of the things immediately handled and received, in the completely different *material* of the two dispensations, wherein should the resemblance be found, but in the common truths and relations alike pervading both? By means of an earthly sanctuary and the manifold carnal ordinances growing out of it, and continually circling around it, God manifested on his part the same character and government toward his people, and required on their part the same exercises of principle toward him, which he does now under the spiritual and heavenly dispensation of the gospel. In the immediate ends to be accomplished, and the apparatus provided for accomplishing them, the two dispensations are as far asunder as heaven is from the earth; but in both alike we see a pure and holy God, enshrined in the recesses of a glorious sanctuary,—unapproachable by guilty and polluted flesh, but through a medium of powerful intercession and cleansing efficacy,—yet to those, who so approach, most merciful and gracious, full of loving-kindness, and plenteous in redemption,—while in every act of sincere approach on their part, there is necessarily brought into exercise, the same feelings of contrition and abasement, self-renunciation, realizing faith, child-like dependence, and adoring gratitude. So that the preparatory, and the ultimate dispensation, considered in their general character and design, disclosed substantially the same views of God, and in doing so, awoke the same feelings in the hearts of his worshippers;—but the former only as the shadow of the latter,—a resemblance, but not the substance, —a representation in outward, earthly, and perishable materials,

* Heb. x. 9, 13, 14. "The entire mass of Jewish sacrifices were offered for the purpose of obtaining the advantages of this life."—Outram.

and with respect to the concerns of flesh and time, of the spiritual ideas and principles which the dispensation of the gospel embodies in things not made with hands, and with respect to objects truly heavenly and divine.

We find in New Testament scripture only another mode of explaining the general nature of the prophetic symbols belonging to the dispensation of Moses; and the light in which it presents the subject does not materially differ from that already unfolded. According to it the Levitical institutions contained the *rudiments* or elementary principles of the gospel. Thus, in Col. ii. 20, all carnal ordinances are named "the rudiments of the world;" and, in Gal. iv. 3, the Jewish worshippers are said to have been "in bondage under the elements, or rudiments of the world," so long as they lived in subjection to the ordinances of Moses. The expression also in the third chapter of the same Epistle, of the law having been ordained as a "schoolmaster to bring men to Christ," if understood of the Levitical institutions, as it must in great measure be, may be said to include the same view of the subject, since it is the part of a schoolmaster to communicate to those under his tuition the elements or rudiments of learning, and by so doing to form and prepare their minds to a capacity for receiving the higher branches of knowledge. Such certainly was the design, which the institutions and ordinances of the law were intended to serve, as typical of gospel things. The objects, with which they were immediately conversant, were visible, fleshly, and temporal; but the mould or pattern according to which it presented these to the view was so far from being exclusively adapted to things of such a nature, that it seems to apply most appropriately to things spiritual and divine, and, apart from such application, appears like a cumbrous apparatus for working out a comparatively insignificant result. And just as the child is prepared for apprehending the outlines and proportions of the globe by seeing them traced before him on maps of a few spans long, or as in learning the properties of figures, which his eye can take in at a glance, he become familiar with the laws and principles which regulate the movements of the material universe; so the church of the Old Testament in handling the fleshly ritual of Moses, had her mind familiarized to the elements of all divine truth and wisdom; the great lines and features of God's everlasting kingdom were there presented in a form, which could be grasped by the hand, on a scale of things which could be scanned by the eye, of a spiritual babe; and with every essential principle and idea he had already imbibed, only transferred from things fleshly and temporal to things heavenly and eternal, he might have been translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Thus were the members of the Jewish church under the rudiments of the world, receiving as from the hand of a schoolmaster, and in reference to objects easily known and understood, that elementary instruction, that acquaintance with first truths and principles, which might best prepare them for apprehending the sublime realities of the gospel.

Viewed in this light, which we may now call the scriptural one, we see at once the essential unity, which pervades the dispensations of Moses and Christ, and the nature of that progression in the divine plan, which rendered the former a proper stepping-stone and door-way to the other. The religion of both covenants is thus found to be one and the same; only, it appears in the one case as on a lower platform, disclosing its relations and ideas amid the inferior concerns of flesh and time, while in the other these are seen rising to embrace heaven and earth, time and eternity. And as ideas and relations are more palpable to the view of the mind, and lie more within the grasp of its comprehension, when exhibited on a small scale, in corporeal forms, and amid familiar and present objects, than on a scale of large dimensions, and in reference to unseen, spiritual, and heavenly objects; so the economy of outward symbolical institutions naturally and effectually prepared the way for the economy of ultimate, divine realities. But this, it must be observed, simply as symbolical institutions, not in their typical reference; that is, as expressive of the relations and ideas, which were common to both dispensations, not as prospectively and obscurely shadowing forth the glorious realities, which were peculiarly to belong to the gospel dispensation. It was comparatively an easy thing for the Jewish worshipper to understand the several bearings of the relation in which by the law of Moses he stood to an earthly sanctuary, or the process of an external purification through means of water and the blood of slain victims applied to his body — much more easy than for the Christian to apprehend aright his relation to a heavenly sanctuary, and the cleansing of his conscience from the guilt of sin by the inward application of the blood of Christ, and the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. But for the Jewish worshipper to do both his own and the Christian's part — both to read the meaning of the symbol, as embodying truths belonging to an existing, carnal ritual, and distinctly apprehend its typical bearing on the spiritual and divine realities of a coming dispensation, would have required a reach of discernment and a strength of faith far beyond what is needed in the Christian; for it had been, not, like him, to discern the spiritual when the spiritual was come, but to do it through the help merely of the carnal; not simply to look with open eye into the deepest mysteries of God's kingdom, when these mysteries were fully disclosed, but to do so while they were buried amid the thick folds of a cumbrous drapery, which was all that immediately appeared. This might have been, and we have no doubt in certain cases was, to some extent done, by members of the old covenant, as we shall take occasion at another place to state more fully; but it could not be properly required of the Jewish worshipper, nor could the conveying of such knowledge concerning the realities of the gospel be the distinguishing characteristic of the Mosaic symbols, as embodying the substance of a preparatory religion. As such, the preparatory must have been simpler and easier, than the final; and it could only have been so, by being regarded in its symbolical, as contradistinguished from its typical, character—regarded not in its secret and

prophetical reference to the gospel antitypes, but in its exhibition on the scale of earthly things, and by means of fleshly observances, of the great truths and principles, or ideas and relations, which were to reappear in those antitypes amid the sublime objects of a spiritual world and an eternal salvation.*

We have as yet conducted this investigation with reference merely to the symbolical institutions of the Old Testament, or what are usually called the ritual types. And before we endeavour to apply the light thence derived further, or consider how far the character found to belong to those symbolical institutions may not also belong to other things connected with God's earlier dispensations, it is of importance to notice, that not a portion merely, but the whole of the Mosaic ritual, is declared to possess the character in question. All its rites and services were shadows of good things to come, or contained the rudiments of the heavenly kingdom. And yet while New Testament scripture declares this, it deals very sparingly in particular examples, but leaves the application of the general principle very much in the hand of individual Christians, to be made as they themselves see fit. It nowhere tells us, for example, what was either immediately or prophetically symbolized by the holy place, or the show-bread, or the golden candlestick, or the ark of the covenant, or the cherubim, or indeed any of the services connected with the tabernacle, with the exception of a very few of the sacrificial rites. Even the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was written on purpose to show the typical and shadowy character of the Old Testament dispensation, while it is most express in asserting this character to belong to the tabernacle as a whole and to each one of its services, yet contains no particular explanation of these beyond the rite of expiatory sacrifice, and the action of the high-priest in presenting it, especially on the day of yearly atonement. With that testimony respecting their general character, and this particular illustration to guide us in the application of it, we are left to find our own path through all that remains of the tabernacle and its manifold services. Those who insist on an explicit warrant being produced from Scripture for every individual type, will find their principle conducts them but a short way even through that region of the affairs of the old covenant, which on the authority of inspiration they cannot but admit to be throughout typical. But of what avail is this general ad-

* If any one will look into the older works, which profess to handle the typical character of the Mosaic symbols, he will find them quite silent upon the points discussed above. For example, Lowman on the Rational of the Hebrew worship, or Outram de Sac. Lib. I. c. xviii., where he comes to consider "the nature and force of a sacred type," give no proper or satisfactory explanations of the questions, in what precisely the resemblance between the type and the antitype consisted, and how the one tended to prepare the way for the other. We are told frequently enough, that the "Hebrew ritual contained a plan, or sketch, or pattern, or shadow of gospel things;" that "the type adumbrated the antitype by something of the same sort with that which is found in the antitype, or by a symbol of it, or by a slender and shadowy image of it, or by something that may somehow be compared with it," &c. But for any more definite information concerning the grounds and rationale of the connexion between the two, or how the exhibition of the type made way for the revelation of the antitype, no instruction is given, and no investigation even is entered into.

mission, so long as they hold to a principle of interpretation, which practically excludes them from touching most of the particulars belonging to the subject? For if the finger of inspiration must itself guide us to the knowledge and understanding of every single type, and if without this all is involved, as they allege, in doubt and uncertainty, it is obvious, that the greater part even of the ritual types must remain substantially a dead letter, and might as well be expunged altogether from the number of types. Indeed, this is no more than what a great authority has already done; for "that such explanations (of types,") says Bishop Marsh, "in various instances, are given in the New Testament, no one can deny. And if it was deemed necessary to explain one type, where could be the expediency or moral fitness of withholding the explanation of others? Must not therefore the *silence* of the New Testament in the case of any *supposed* type, be an argument against the existence of that type?"* And thus from want of particular explanations we get rid of nearly the whole Mosaic ritual, although its services as a whole are declared to have been all "shadows of good things to come, whereof the body is Christ."

This circumstance regarding the scarcity of explanations on particular parts of the Mosaic ritual, is not adverted to by those, who adopt the principle of Bishop Marsh. It seems to be taken for granted by them, that because the ritual as a whole was declared to be typical, there is no need for any further information; this either involves the explanation of each particular part, or renders it unnecessary for us to obtain any such minute explanation. But the practical value of the whole manifestly depends upon the correct and proper understanding of the several parts; if we remain ignorant of this, we might as well not have known, that they actually possessed any typical reference to the better things of the gospel. It cannot be doubted, that in instituting such a mode of worship, and ordaining all its parts to serve as a "testimony (or, evidence,) of those things, which were to be spoken after," God intended that we should be able to read the interpretation of them, as otherwise one grand design of their appointment would of necessity be frustrated. And yet, if we except the work and office of the high-priest in presenting the blood of atonement, it can scarcely be said, that we are furnished with any special information in Scripture concerning the tabernacle and its services, as typical of gospel things. How we ought to proceed amid this silence of Scripture, in applying the general views that have been unfolded to ascertain the import of particular parts, shall be matter of future inquiry and consideration. Meanwhile, the fact that so much of what is undoubtedly typical remains as to the several particulars unexplained, may surely serve to render it highly probable, that in the other, the historical department of the subject, there may also be many unexplained types, and that the supposition of there being such is not in itself so chimerical and extravagant a notion as has not unfrequently been represented.

* Lectures, p. 392.

CHAPTER III.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED, WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO WHAT ARE CALLED HISTORICAL TYPES, SHOWING THESE TO BE ESSENTIALLY ONE IN CHARACTER WITH THE OTHER, AND EQUALLY NECESSARY AS A PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL.

THE dispensation of Moses, we have seen, was in all its institutions and services symbolical of certain truths and principles, which were common, indeed, to both dispensations, but which were destined to find their full development and proper realization in the kingdom of God's dear Son. On the limited scale of earthly and perishable things—in the construction of a material tabernacle and the performance of bodily services connected with it, there was a plain and sensible exhibition of those truths and principles, which were in the fulness of time to be developed on the grand scale of a world's redemption from sin and hell by the prevailing mediation of Christ. In that pre-arranged, though limited and imperfect exhibition of the fundamental ideas and relations of the gospel, stood the real nature of its typical character. And we now come to put the question, whether this general character may not also have been possessed by the other facts and transactions of sacred history, in so far as these owed their appointment to God, or carried on them the stamp of his authority? Whether, in short, the events of God's providence, as well as the institutions of God's worship, in respect to his church, may not have been arranged upon a plan fitted for bringing out in the same way the leading truths and principles of the gospel? If the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ, with the news of his great salvation, was the object mainly contemplated by the mind of God from the beginning of the world, and with which the church was ever travailing as in birth—if consequently, the previous dispensations, antediluvian and postdiluvian, patriarchal as well as Levitical, were chiefly designed to lead to and terminate upon Christ and the things of his salvation, what can be more natural than to suppose, that the whole antecedent revelations of God were so directed as to be ever unfolding, like the complex machinery of the Mosaic ritual, on a limited and earthly scale, the elements of gospel truth and heavenly principle? This would only manifest such a unity in the divine procedure as we might expect to pervade it; and instead of setting the Mosaic ritual by itself, as if it was singular in the respect it bore to gospel times, would only render it a more full and systematic representation of what was to be unfolded in Christ—thus forming a great, but by no means an anomalous, advance in the preparatory arrangements, which were to issue in the final establishment of God's everlasting kingdom.

There is enough in this consideration to make it seem highly

probable, that the same character belongs alike to the historical and the ritual matter of ancient Scripture, and that in the arrangement of both the same design was kept in view, and the same end aimed at. But the probability is greatly increased, when we take into account the manner, in which the historical types are mentioned in the New Testament. In the tenth chapter of 1st Corinthians a variety of facts are produced from the history of ancient Israel in the wilderness, concerning which the apostle says, that the things in question "happened unto them for ensamples, (literally, as types,) and are written for our admonition;" or, as he more distinctly explains it in verse 6, "these things were our examples (types,) to the intent that we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted." In plain terms, God inflicted on them certain judgments for the carnal desires which they allowed to gain the ascendency over them—and this not only on their account, but also as a clear and solemn warning to us, that if like desires were indulged on our part, they would certainly be visited with corresponding judgments. The facts in question are appealed to simply as manifestations of a principle of the divine government, which reaches also unto us, and indeed has its full and proper development only under the gospel, viz. that the carnal, the worldly-minded shall not inherit the kingdom of God, but shall perish in their sins.

To render this more plain and palpable to the understanding, an inspired writer in another part of New Testament scripture (Heb. iii. and iv.) takes one of the most important of the facts above mentioned—the destruction of the Israelites in the wilderness for their unbelief—and comments on it at large, as affording an exact representation of what in spiritual things is to befall those who believe not the testimony of the grace of God. The word *type*, indeed, is not employed in the discussion there, but the idea conveyed by it is undoubtedly expressed by the author, inasmuch as he affirms the exclusion of the unbelieving Israelites from the land of Canaan, not only to afford a reasonable presumption, but to provide a valid ground, for asserting, that unbelievers under the present dispensation could not be allowed to enter into heaven. Indeed, so complete in point of principle is the identity of the two cases, that he applies to both indiscriminately and without any explanation of the differences that existed between them, the same expressions of "the gospel being preached," of "God's promise of rest," of "the heart being hardened," of "falling through unbelief." Yet the differences were exactly the same, and the resemblance also was the same, with what we have already seen to exist in the symbolical types—the one manifesting in regard to present and earthly things the same rules, relations or principles of government, which the other did in regard to spiritual and heavenly things. In the type, we have the prospect of Canaan, the gospel of an *earthly* promise of rest, and the loss of *temporal* good following its rejection; in the antitype, the prospect of a *heavenly* inheritance, the gospel promise of an *everlasting* rest, attended in the case of those, who reject it in unbelief, with the fearful loss of *eternal life*.

This particular explanation of one of the types mentioned in Corinthians, might obviously be applied, with very little variation, to the others mentioned there; and in regard to some of them, so little account does the apostle make of the differences existing between the case of the Israelites and that of Christians, that we find him using, as was also done in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the language furnished by the circumstances of the one indiscriminately to the other—when he speaks of the Israelites being "baptized," and "eating spiritual food," and "drinking spiritual drink." He perceived in the outward events of their earthly history, to which he refers, the same truths and principles in operation, which are displayed in the higher sphere of the Christian life—and because at one in this respect, he applies the terms borrowed from the latter, without reserve or qualification, to the former.

It is the same substantially with all the other historical types, of which special mention is made in the New Testament; the resemblances between them and gospel things, are precisely similar, and the differences also are similar to those just noticed. Take as an example, the facts connected with the brazen serpent,—the looking unto which as lifted up on the pole, was the means appointed by God for conveying restored health to the serpent-bitten Israelite. As symbolical of the method of recovery propounded to sinners in the gospel, the leading ideas in both are manifestly the same,—on the part of those respectively concerned, a wounded, dying condition,—on the part of God, the conspicuous elevation of something apparently inadequate, yet really effectual to accomplish the cure, and the simple looking to this object as the medium, through which its healing virtue was to flow into the experience of the dying. But these ideas, though common to both cases alike, receive a poor and imperfect manifestation in the one, compared with what they do in the other; there we behold a dying body, but here a perishing soul,—there an uplifted serpent, of all instruments of healing the most unlikely, here a dead man hanging on a tree, of all imaginable persons seemingly the most impotent to save,—there the fleshly eye of the outward man directed to the one, here the spiritual eye of the inner man, the eye of faith, directed to the other. We see the same relations pervading both,—transactions in each, running as it were in parallel directions, but these developing themselves first on a lower, afterwards on a higher territory; in the one case having to do only with things seen, fleshly and temporal, in the other embracing what is unseen, spiritual and eternal. And apart from the purpose of making the history of the church in such things expressive of the truths and principles of the gospel, and prepare the way for their development there, it is impossible to conceive any adequate reason for so singular and extraordinary a mode of procedure being adopted toward the Israelites.

To multiply examples, were but to repeat what has been in substance advanced already, for one characteristic distinguishes all. Yet, as another example, we may select the deluge, which in 1st

Peter is declared, without any explanation, to have been a type of the Christian ordinance of Baptism. The apostle does not tell us how this was typified by the deluge, but by giving us to understand what baptism, as he views it, in its life and power, actually does, he renders the solution of the matter comparatively plain and simple. Baptism, he informs us, saves by virtue of its connexion with the risen power of Christ, and in doing so, puts away, not the filth of the flesh, but the impurity of a sinful and ruined nature, and so makes room for the exercise of a holy nature, or the answer of a good conscience. Sealing our interest in Christ for the cleansing and vital efficacy of his redemption, it may be said to free the soul from the ruinous defilement of sin, and implant in its stead the holy root of that pure and spiritual life which is from Christ. And how did the waters of the deluge typify such a work as this? They did it by sweeping away into the gulf of ruin the mighty mass of the world's corruption, and at the same time bearing on their bosom in safety the ark with its precious treasure of a godly seed,—the root of a new order of life not to be destroyed in such a perdition. Here there was the extermination of a polluted race, which, while it continued, would not suffer the world to live, and the preservation of a godly remnant to serve as the germ of another race, destined to replenish the earth under better auspices,—on the one hand the destruction of a professedly corrupt society, tending only to violence and death, making way, on the other, for a new state of being, to establish and perpetuate itself on earth, and thus fitly shadowing forth on the scale of terrestrial things what takes place upon the soul, when being sealed up to a fellowship with the risen life of Jesus, the deadly corruption of its fleshly nature is put off, and the powers of a new, divine and imperishable nature begin to unfold themselves in its history.

This may suffice to show, that the historical types, in their root and principle, are essentially the same with the ritual,—one character is common to both,—and the proper mode of interpreting the ritual, is also the proper mode of interpreting the historical. Our first business is to ascertain what ideas they unfold, simply as events or transactions in the earlier providence of God, and in their immediate connexion with those, who were personally interested in them; and the ideas thus unfolded on the theatre of an earthly existence, and with respect to things only of a temporal nature, are again reproduced, and far more magnificently developed in the mighty plan of redemption, by means of the sublime realities of God's everlasting kingdom. It is not the mere outward resemblances which may happen to exist between the earlier and the later transactions,—for these may not be found, when we have the best reason to conclude that there is a substantial agreement, a typical connexion, as in the example just adverted to of the deluge and baptism, and may, on the other hand, be found, when there is no agreement or connexion of the kind now in question; it is not these outward resemblances, but the oneness of the ideas or principles brought out in the two classes of events, and

that as belonging to two different parts of one connected scheme of providence, which constitutes the essential character of the one as typical of the other.

It is probable that a connexion of this nature may appear at first sight, not to possess all that is required to satisfy the conditions of a proper typical relationship. People have been so much accustomed to view it in an external aspect, that they naturally figure to themselves some connexion of a more palpable and arbitrary kind, as binding together the type and the antitype. They are disposed to conceive of the former as if it were a kind of pre-ordained pantomime of the latter, or like one of those prefigurative actions, which the prophets were sometimes commanded to perform, meaningless in themselves, yet most significantly foreshowing some impending dispensations of providence. Those typical or prophetical actions of the prophets, doubtless, had much in common with the typical actions of God's providence, of which we now speak. They both alike had respect to other actions yet to come, without which, pre-ordained and foreseen, they would not have existed. They both also stood in a corresponding relation of littleness to the future actions they foreshadowed, representing, on a comparatively small scale, what was afterwards to happen on a much larger one, and thus forming a fit preparation for enabling the minds of men to take in the ideas belonging to the latter. But they differed in this, that the typical actions of the prophets had respect *solely* to the events they prefigured, and apart from them were altogether devoid of significance; whereas the typical actions of God's providence, as well as his symbolical institutions of worship, had a moral meaning of their own, apart from, and above the reference they carried to the future transactions of the gospel. Such a connexion, therefore, as that which existed between those prophetical actions and the judgments they predicted, however it may accord with the notions usually entertained of the typical matter of ancient Scripture, is not warranted by Scripture itself, nor, supposing the connexion to have been of such a nature, could the typical transactions have served the purposes for which they were appointed. Indeed, when rightly considered, the connexion which we seek to establish, is of a more close and vital, as it certainly is of a more important natue, than such as stands merely in outward resemblances. For it proves that God not only had in view, so many centuries before, the coming events and dispensation of the gospel, but modelled his plan of government so as to embody in the current transactions of his providence, the very principles and ideas, which were to receive in the realities of the gospel their ultimate and highest manifestation. It was from the respect they carried to these great realities, that those providential arrangements possessed the essential character they did. On this account God not only ordained their existence, but threw into them, so to speak, his very mind and soul, and made them expressive of his grandest truths and final ends of government. To make the connexion, therefore, between the earlier and the later events,

consist chiefly in their exemplifying the same principles and ideas, with the view of rendering the one a preparation for the other, is only to withdraw it from a less to a more vital and important part of the transactions,—from the outer shell and form, to the inner truth and substance of the history,—so that in the type there is not merely some perceptible resemblance to the antitype, but the same character, the same life and meaning.

To render this more clear and manifest, let us compare, for a moment, an alleged example of historical type, where the resemblance between it and the supposed antitype is entirely of an outward or superficial kind, with either of the two specified above,—the brazen serpent or the deluge. In the latter of these, there could scarcely be said to be any outward resemblance to the ordinance it typified, but in both of them alike there were very strong lines of resemblance, of a more inward and substantial kind, between them and their respective antitypes,—the same principles of government on the part of God, the same kind of experiences on the part of man. So that we can easily recognise in them the impress of one divine hand, or view them as corresponding parts of one grand economy, and from being assured of the one having taken effect in temporal things, should have no difficulty in concluding that the other must receive a similar accomplishment in spiritual. But take as an example of the other class, the occupation of Abel as a shepherd, which is considered by Witsius to have been prefigurative of Christ in his character as the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls. Here we certainly have a sort of outward resemblance between the two facts, but what substantial, what real connexion can we discern between them? What light does the one throw upon the other? What expectation beforehand could the earlier beget of the later, or what confirmation afterwards could it supply? Supposing there was any thing typical in the death of Abel, and that his blood bore a respect to the blood of sprinkling shed upon the cross, yet what additional value could the circumstance derive from the previous occupation of the martyr? Christ died, indeed, as the spiritual shepherd of the sheep, but Abel did not die on account of his having literally followed the occupation of a shepherd,—his death was not necessary to his fulfilling the duties of that occupation, nor so far as we know had any essential connexion with it. What purpose, then, could be served by investing this part of Abel's history with a typical character? In hunting out such loose and shallow resemblances, and dignifying them with the name of types, do we not seem to be amusing ourselves with superficial inanities, worthless even if real, rather than obtaining any insight into the mind and dispensations of God? But when, on the contrary, we look into the past records of God's providence, and find there in the characters, events and institutions of former times, an identity of principle, a coincidence of plans and operations with those unfolded in the work of redemption, we cannot but feel that we have something of real weight and magnitude to grapple with. And in so far as we have reason fur-

ther to conclude, not only that such agreements existed, but that they were purposely designed, and skilfully arranged, the earlier for the later, the earthly and temporal for the spiritual and heavenly, we are manifestly furnished with what deeply affects each series of facts, and by thus being enabled to read the records of both covenants, as under one aspect, and in close relationship with each other, we may bring the one materially to illustrate, or confirm the other.

But should it be admitted, that the view we have endeavoured to establish as to the *nature* of the historical types, is the sound and scriptural one, how, it may still be asked, does this bear upon the other question, which respects their number or frequency? Let it be granted that their essential character is precisely what has been described, how do we thereby come nearer to the point of determining, whether we are to adhere closely to the examples specified and explained in New Testament scripture, or may be warranted in travelling beyond this narrow limit? There is, first of all, as we noticed at the beginning of this chapter, a strong presumption, since the character of the historical types is so precisely similar to the ritual, that in point of extent also the one shall bear a close resemblance to the other. It is not a few only, but the whole of the rites and ceremonies belonging to the Old Testament church, which possess a typical character; and so we may reasonably conclude, that the same character belongs, not to some isolated facts of Old Testament history, but to the whole of these, in so far as they can be viewed as expressing the will, and manifesting the purposes of God. Nor is this conclusion weakened by the circumstance, that it is comparatively so small a portion of the facts of Old Testament history, which have received a typical explanation in the scriptures of the New,—for, as has already been remarked, the same holds true of the ritual part of the Old Testament, of which a very small portion only has been particularly explained, though it was *throughout* typical.

But if the view itself, which we have adopted, of the historical types, be the correct one, it is quite obvious, that besides this argument from analogy, there is a still stronger argument arising out of the very nature of the types themselves. If their essential character stood in representing the ideas, relations and principles of the gospel, with the view of preparing the way for its introduction, then a certain degree of frequency was absolutely necessary to fulfil the design of their appointment; and the more the past dealings and providence of God was pervaded by them, the more certainly would that design be accomplished. A few straggling examples, such as those specified in New Testament scripture, could scarcely have been of any avail for such a purpose. They must have been of sufficient number and variety to familiarize the members of the ancient church with the great lineaments of the gospel plan,—and this, indeed, they could only have done by pervading all the history, as well as all the religion of the old covenant. Not that every action of each individual there mentioned, and every

occurrence which took place, must necessarily have shadowed forth something of a similar and corresponding nature under the gospel. In the history, as well as in the religion, there doubtless would be many incidental or subordinate parts, which had respect only to the present,—while still the great chain and current of events might have been designed to point toward the future, and to cast light upon the coming events of the kingdom of God. And if the way, in which *any* of them was to do this, were that we have endeavoured to establish,—by unfolding in earthly and temporal things the same ideas, relations and principles, on which the whole scheme of salvation was to be founded, then, we repeat, (whatever limitations it may be necessary to introduce in regard to occasional parts of the transactions, and to which we shall afterwards advert,) the typical character could not, in the nature of things, be confined to a few scattered or disjointed examples; it must have spread itself over a large field, and branched itself out into a thousand particulars: it must, in short, have been developed through an entire and varied system of providential arrangements.

Thus the one point grows by a kind of natural necessity out of the other. If the historical types were what we have represented them to be, they must have embraced a much larger portion of Old Testament history than is allowed by those, who would confine them to the few examples specially noticed by the pen of inspiration; and we have only to refer to these examples themselves, to confirm the argument derived from the general nature of the types, into a ground of assurance as strong, as on such a topic could be reasonably expected. For not only can we discover no essential difference between the historical characters and facts, thus expressly characterized as typical, and a multitude of others recorded in the Old Testament, but the very manner in which the former are noticed, clearly indicates that they were not designed to be held up as the *only historical* prefigurations of gospel truth, —having been selected for no other apparent reason, than because they were appropriate to the subject, in connexion with which they are referred to,—and so unavoidably strengthening the conviction, that many others might in like manner have been specified, had the purpose of the inspired writers required them to do so. But if this conviction stood in need of any further confirmation, it may surely be found in the circumstance formerly adverted to, that in the Epistle to the Hebrews a reproof is given to the disciples, for not being able to understand, without an instructor, the spiritual truths couched in the history of Melchisedec. Not only so, but the capacity to make such interpretations of Old Testament scripture, in connexion with the spiritual things of the gospel, is represented as a proof of ripened skill and understanding in the things of God, as opposed to the puerile thoughts and apprehensions of childhood. So that there is a sense, in which the saying of Augustine,—"the Old Testament is one great prophecy of the New,"—is strictly true, even in regard to those parts of ancient scripture, which seem farthest removed from the prophet-

ical. And if the inspired writers of the New Testament, when seeking to unfold and commend the truth of God to their countrymen, repair for previous manifestations of it, to what is written of Melchisedec, or the brazen serpent, or the deluge, we are but treading in their footsteps, and deriving from the records of God's past dispensations, what their example and their instructions alike teach us to find there, when for a similar purpose we select what is written of Adam, or Noah, or Abraham, or Joseph, or Joshua, or Samson,—for, in so far as the transactions, related in the history of these and other characters of former times, exhibit the mind and government of God, they are all pregnant with gospel principle, and disclose to the enlightened eye the essential elements of the kingdom of heaven.

In pursuing this investigation, we have confined our attention to the light furnished on the subject by New Testament scripture. But very strong and important confirmation to the views now unfolded may be derived also from certain portions of the scriptures of the Old Testament. This we shall endeavour to show in regard to the prophetical writings, when we come to treat of the combination of type with prophecy. And, meanwhile, we appeal to another portion of Old Testament scripture, which yields a testimony in our favour peculiarly important and convincing—the Book of Psalms. These psalms are chiefly summaries, in a poetical and impressive form, of great truths and principles, derived from the past acts and revelations of God, by some of the most gifted members of the church, and accompanied with such pious reflections and devout breathings of soul, as the subjects naturally suggested, through God's Spirit, to their minds. In them is expressed, we may say, the very life and essence of the symbolical institutions and manifold transactions in providence, through which the members of the old covenant were instructed in the knowledge, and trained to the service of the true God—and so expressed as to be most admirably fitted for forming the minds of all to right views and feelings concerning God, and enabling them to give due utterance to these in their exercises of devotion. But was this the character and design of the Book of Psalms merely to the Old Testament church? Is it not equally adapted for the suitable expression of pious feeling, for a help to devotion, for a directory of spiritual thought and holy living, to the church of the New Testament? Is there a feature in the divine character as now developed in the gospel, a spiritual principle or desire in the mind of an enlightened Christian, a becoming exercise of affection or a matter of vital experience in the divine life, of which the record is not to be found in this invaluable portion of holy writ? And how could such a book have existed among the sacred writings centuries before the Christian era, but for the fact, that the old and the new covenants, however much they may have differed in outward form, and however the transactions respectively connected with them may have been inferior in the one case to the other, yet were alike pervaded by the same great truths and prin-

ciples? Thus the Book of Psalms, standing mid-way between both covenants, and serving equally to the members of each as the handmaid of a living piety, is a witness of the essential identity of their primary and fundamental ideas. *There* the disciples of Moses and of Christ meet as on common ground, the one taking up as their most natural and fitting expressions of faith and hope, the hallowed words, which the other had been wont to use in their devotions ages before, and then bequeathed as a legacy to succeeding generations of believers. So intimately connected were they with the affairs and circumstances of the dispensation, which was to vanish away, that they one and all took their occasion from these, and are fraught throughout with references to them; and yet, so accordant are they to the better things of the dispensation that abideth, so perfectly adapted to the ways of God as exhibited in the gospel, and the spiritual life required of its professors, that they are invariably the most used and relished by those, who are most established in the grace, and most replenished with the blessing of God. It was confessedly carnal institutions, under which the holy men worshipped, who were employed by God to indite these divine songs, as it was also the transactions of an earthly and temporal life, which formed the immediate ground and occasion of the sentiments they unfold; yet where in all scripture will the believer, who "worships in spirit and in truth," more readily go to find language for expressing his loftiest conceptions of God, for portraying his most spiritual and enlarged views of the character he is called to maintain, or breathing forth his most elevated desires and feelings after divine things? So that the Psalms may well be termed, with Augustine, "an epitome of the whole Scriptures," and a summary, not as Luther said, of the Old Testament merely, but of both Testaments together, in their grand elements of truth and outlines of history. "What is there necessary for man to know," says Hooker, "which the Psalms are not able to teach?" They are to beginners an easy and familiar introduction, a mighty augmentation of all virtue and knowledge in such as are entered before, a strong confirmation to the most perfect among others. Heroical magnanimity, exquisite justice, grave moderation, exact wisdom, repentance unfeigned, unwearied patience, the mysteries of God, the sufferings of Christ, the terrors of wrath, the comforts of grace, the works of Providence over this world, and the promised joys of that world which is to come, all good necessarily to be either known, or had, or done, this one celestial fountain yieldeth." We may, therefore, conclusively appeal to the character of this extraordinary book, as confirmatory of the general views, which it has been our object to establish. It renders clear as noon-day the perfect identity of those great truths and principles, on which both economies were founded as to the institutions of worship, and the providential dealings respectively connected with them. And as we know the one to have been all arranged in preparation for the other, consequently in pre-ordained connexion with it, we thus learn what was the real nature of the

resemblances, which formed the connecting link between the things of the two covenants, and how we are to explain the one as types and the other as antitypes.*

Let us pause here for a moment to reflect on the light, which the view now given of the connexion between the leading portions of Old Testament history and the truths of the gospel, throws upon the nature and design of that interesting part of scripture, and the transactions recorded in it. It will hardly be denied, that the main and ultimate object of all God's dealing with the Old Testament church, the communications he made to her, and the experiences through which he caused her to pass, was to prepare her for the first coming of the Son of God. His manifestation in human flesh, for the purpose of man's redemption, was from the first pointed to as the great era of her history, and her participation of his purchased inheritance of blessing was ever waited and longed for as the glorious consummation of her hopes. Hence the prophetic word began its course with the entrance of sin—the first promise being given on the very spot that witnessed the fall, and that promise containing within its brief but pregnant meaning the whole work and issue of redemption. And that the person, the work and kingdom of Jesus, was the great burden of all that was afterwards delivered in prophecy to the church, a higher than human authority has assured us; for it is declared, that to him "all the prophets gave witness," and that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy,"—its pervading scope and object. Accordingly, if we search through the earlier periods of the church's history, we shall never find her long without the prophetic witness—at one time cheering her with hopes of coming honour and enlargement—at another giving intimations of a fearful and desperate conflict with the powers of evil—waxing continually more distinct in its utterances and more copious in its details, as the great purpose of the Father drew nearer to its accom-

* Some notice was taken in the Introduction of the great change which has of late years been in progress throughout Germany, regarding the subject of types generally; and I here subjoin, in connexion with this immediate branch of it, a quotation from a German periodical, as given by Hartmann, (in his Verbinnung des Alten Test. wit dem Newen, p. 6,) which may at once serve as an additional proof of the improved tone of German theology, and confirm the view above taken of Old Testament history. "Must not Judaism be of great moment to Christianity, since both stand in brotherly and sisterly relations to each other? The historical books of the Hebrews are also religious books; the religious import is involved in the historical; the history of the people, as a divine leading and management in respect to them, was at the same time a training for religion, precisely as the Old Testament is a preparation for the New. These historical-religious views we must undoubtedly apprehend and maintain in our study and use of the sacred Scriptures, whose grand aim we, in like manner, may not doubt, is to awaken a holy, godlike frame of mind, and to lead us to a pious, heaven-devoted life."—To the like effect also Jacobi, as quoted by Sack, on the words of Christ, that as the serpent was lifted up, so *must* (ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ) the Son of man be lifted up, &c.: "History is also prophecy. The past contains within itself the future as an embryo, and at certain points, discernible by the spiritual eye, the greater, as in an image, is seen represented in the smaller, the internal in the external, the present or future in the past. Here there is throughout nothing arbitrary, throughout there is a divine *must*, connexion and arrangement pregnant with mutual relations."

plishment, until the very time and place of his Son's appearing had come to be well understood, and the sacred remnant of worshippers were like men standing on their watch-tower, with outstretched necks looking for him, whose coming should be the consolation of Israel.

That this was the leading design of the word of God in regard to the prophecies it contained, admits of no reasonable doubt, the stream of prophecy being in this respect so clear and determinate, and the design having obviously to a considerable extent reached its end. But it is manifest from a slight reflection, that another kind of preparation also was required for the ancient church—one that should bring her sentiments and character into suitable accordance with her expectations, and train her through all her members to the exercise of those feelings, principles and associations, which should make them ready to own and submit to the yoke of Messiah. For the object of Christ's appearing was not to execute an undertaking, that should stand altogether separate and apart from the other manifestations of Godhead—unfolding views of the divine character peculiar to itself, and resting simply on its own inherent evidences for acceptance among men. He came to reveal the Father and finish his work—to carry into effect the divine purpose, which, indeed, had for its aim the achievement of the world's redemption, but through this also the manifestation of the adorable Godhead in its infinite and varied perfections—its peerless majesty, yet lowly condescension—its stainless purity, yet yearning compassion toward the guilty and polluted—its inexorable justice, yet gracious and bountiful provisions for those, who have wantonly exposed themselves to its penalties—all, in short, that there is of mercy and of judgment, of love and holiness, in the character of God, as necessary to be displayed in the redemption and government of fallen man. But as those things, which are highly esteemed among men, are often abomination in the sight of God, so, and for the same reason, the divine principles, which are interwoven with the incarnation of Christ and the spiritual government growing out of it, are most remote from the natural apprehensions of men, most alien to the natural expectations of reason, and painful even as death to the desires and inclinations of the natural heart. The truth of this is witnessed even now by the unblushing infidelity, which maintains its front of opposition amid the full blaze of the gospel—by the worldly and anti-christian sentiments, which so frequently appear in works of science and literature—by every sermon, indeed, that is preached and every missionary effort that is made, which all presuppose the existence, and labour to overcome the opposition, of that evil heart of unbelief, with which the entire mass of humanity is leavened. And could we throw ourselves back to a time, when we should have been utterly ignorant of what from our infancy we have familiarly known—when every thing belonging to redemption should have come upon us with the surprise of unheard-of novelties, differing from all we had previously known in the views and principles they embodied, as well

as the facts which they revealed, how much more should we have been conscious of the natural repugnance in question! How strongly should our carnal and untutored reason have recoiled from the wondrous scheme of redemption, as an unbecoming and incredible representation of the mind and character of Godhead!

This feature of Messiah's work and dispensation is strikingly noticed by the prophet Isaiah, in ch. lxiv. 4, in illustration of which we may do well to quote the excellent remarks of Vitringa on the passage: "By those things, which no one hath seen or heard, but which were prepared by God for those who wait for him, we are to understand the great salvation that was to be revealed in Messiah, with his wonderful dispensation, and the strange events that should happen during the ages of its continuance—all which can be truly and practically known by those only, who have been endowed with spiritual understanding. The new dispensation is wholly made up of things strange and wonderful; all that you see and hear of it is against carnal wisdom. The appearance of the Son of God in an humble condition—the ministry of the gospel by him in person, and the circumstances connected with it—his shame and sufferings, his resurrection and ascension into heaven—the nature of the kingdom instituted by him, which was spiritual—the blessings of his kingdom, which were also spiritual—the instruments employed for advancing the kingdom, men furnished with no worldly learning, and destitute of outward authority—the gift of the Holy Spirit—the calling of the Gentiles, the rejection of the greater and more eminent portion of the Jewish people, &c. These things were indeed such as the carnal eye had never seen, and the carnal ear had never heard. Hitherto they had never existed, nor could they without express revelation, by any thought or natural ingenuity on the part of man, have been foreseen or understood." And though they were disclosed from time to time in the word of prophecy, yet being so far removed from the natural apprehensions of men, so contrary both to their expectations and their desires, if there had been no connexion between them and the previous dealings and dispensations of God, excepting what existed in the word of prophecy, not only could there have been no distinct conception of them by the people of God before the things themselves were revealed, but no preparation of mind for understanding and receiving them when revealed—no spiritual training for the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, such as might have rendered the change from the past to the future things of God, a natural and fitting transition.

It is certainly not to be denied, that in the truths and principles of the gospel, even when viewed by themselves, apart from every thing that went before, there is a self-evidencing power, which commends itself to the natural feelings and convictions of men. Without this, the gospel could not have made the progress it has done, and is still doing, among rude and barbarous nations, who have not intelligence enough to weigh and canvass properly its historical evidence. But though there is a force in the truths of

God, which, when aided by the testimony of conscience, and the grace of the Spirit of God, is sufficient to make these in process of time to triumph over all hinderance and opposition, it was not on that account the less important and necessary for the furtherance of the gospel, that every thing should have been done that was practicable and competent, for softening the natural prejudices, and predisposing aright, the minds of those, who already were under the teaching and discipline of God. Therefore, besides the faith, and hope, and longing desire, which were awakened in the church toward redemption by the intimations of prophecy, there was needed also the work of preparatory dispensations, so that when she had reaped the full benefit of these, and was about to enter into "the dispensations of the fulness of times," her past history and pre-established views, and acquired character, might be in suitable accordance with what was now to be brought to her experience. And how otherwise could this be done, than by coupling with the word of prophecy the closely allied and fitting accompaniment of types,—in which, by means of institutions and ordinances, transactions and events, all skilfully arranged and properly diversified, the church was privileged to witness on a common field, and relation to things seen and temporal, the operation of the same moral elements, the manifestations of the same cardinal truths and principles, on which the spiritual and everlasting kingdom of God was to be constructed? For thus the various acts and revelations of God, from the first opening of the sluices of sin downwards,—the events of his providence,—the order, constitution, and history of his church,—the ordinances with which he furnished her, the privileges with which he endowed her, the oppressions and deliverances, the judgments and mercies through which he brought her,—though scattered over a wide field, and many of them of smallest importance in themselves, were yet so carefully chosen and appointed, as to bring out the general characteristics of the gospel dispensation. They present a sort of rough draught of "the kingdom of heaven,"—unfolding by means of seen and earthly transactions, the ideas and relations, which were to be embodied in its sublime realities, its spiritual experience, its divine blessings and imperishable glories. Hence was it, that the things which are written of the history and worship of the ancient church, are so frequently brought into remembrance by our Lord and his apostles; and that, not merely as furnishing a sacred language, rich and copious for the varied and proper expression of divine truth. This had been itself an invaluable service rendered by the things of the Old Testament dispensation to the New, as affording terms already used and hallowed in the church of God, for the clear and ample communication of the spiritual and heavenly truths of the gospel. But this service they did, and only could render, by possessing what fitted them for performing another greatly more important,—possessing a real form and resemblance of these gospel things themselves, exhibited on the world's theatre of ordinary characters, transactions, and events, and thus serving as a ladder

whereby to mount up and scale the high tower of heavenly wisdom and grace, reared in the glorious dispensation of Christ. So that what is written in the history of the Old Testament church, concerning God's dealings toward her, and the institutions and providences which she received at his hands, was all written for the learning of the New Testament church; and the things which happened to the one, were appointed for types to the other; nay, were contrived with such minute and wonderful adaptation to the mysteries of redemption, that to be able to read with a clear and discerning eye the truths and lessons they were designed to teach, concerning the work and dispensation of Christ, is to reach the stature of a full-grown, ripened understanding in the things of God.

It is in this connexion, perhaps, more than any other, that the chief import should be sought of the expression, which is used of the period of Christ's appearance in the flesh,—that it was "in the fulness of time." Its *chief* import, we say, not by any means its only one. For there is a manifold wisdom in all the arrangements of God; and in the moral, as well as in the physical world, he often makes many things conspire to the production of one result, and one result to accomplish many important ends. We hold it to be far from misspent learning, but learning well and profitably employed, to search far and wide amid the records of past time, with the view of discovering the many lines in the world's history, which all converged toward that period which witnessed the manifestation of the Son of God, as the one above all others that was best suited for the institution of his kingdom, and most advantageous for spreading the knowledge of its truth over the nations of the earth. But whatever light may be gathered from these external researches, it should never be forgotten, that God's own record must furnish the paramount reasons for determining the peculiar fitness of the period in question, and his own dealings with the church, the chief ground out of which those reasons are derived. In every arrangement affecting the interests of his church, and, therefore, pre-eminently in what concerned the time of his Son's incarnation, which is the centre point of all that touches her interests, the state and condition of the church itself, is the first thing contemplated by the eye of God, the whole world besides occupying no more than a dependent and subordinate place. And so when we are told, that Christ "came in the fulness of time," the fact of which we are mainly assured, is, that all had been done, which was fit and necessary to be done, for bringing the church into a state of preparation for the event of his appearing,—not only that the time marked by prophecy had arrived, and expectation, rising on the wings of prophecy, had reached its appointed height, but also that the series of earthly dealings and dispensations was now complete, which were designed to make the church familiar with the great truths and principles of God's everlasting kingdom, and prepare her for hailing the erection of this kingdom, amid the great realities and blessed prospects of the gospel.

It is true, indeed, that we search in vain for the success, which

we might naturally have expected to arise from such a design on the part of God, and that with the exception of a comparatively small number, his professing church was found so completely unprepared for the doctrine of Christ's kingdom, as to reject it with abhorrence and disdain. But this by no means proves the absence of the design, nor yet the unfitness of the means employed for carrying it into effect. It only proves how insufficient the best means are in themselves to enlighten with spiritual truth the darkness of the human mind, and discipline its corrupt will,—how, when carnal motives are allowed to form the underground of a religious profession, and selfish desires usurp the place of divine love, the whole counsel of God is sure of being marred of its effect. It is a striking monument to all coming ages of the world, of the natural enmity and rebelliousness of the heart toward God,—showing how it may remain essentially untaught, even after the fullest course of instruction, and rush headlong in its career of guilt and folly, against the clearest intimations of Heaven's purpose. But while we cannot overlook these dark signs of unremoved ignorance and perversity in the mass of the Jewish people, we are also to remember, that there was still a blessed remnant,—"the election according to grace;" who, as the church in the world, so they in the church, ever hold the prime place in God's regard. There were Simeon and Anna, Zacharias and Elizabeth, Mary and Joseph, the band of apostles, and the multitude, no small number after all, who flocked to the standard of Jesus, as soon as his kingdom was fairly erected, and set before them in the grandeur and completeness of its parts. And did not the course of God's preparatory arrangements answer its purpose in regard to them? Let the style of argument and address employed by the apostles with their countrymen, furnish the reply. How much do both their language and their ideas savour of the sanctuary! How perpetually do they resort to Moses, as well as the prophets!—to the predictions, indeed, which spake of Christ and the things of his salvation, but not to these only,—to the records also of by-gone history, and sacred institutions; upon which they continually threw themselves back for support, and argued from them in a way, which took for granted, that the facts and revelations of the gospel were but a new and higher development of the principles, by which the events of their past history, and the services of their worship, were alike pervaded. These were scarcely less instrumental, than the signs and wonders, which the apostles received power to perform, in enabling them to build up the foundations of the Christian faith, and were an armory from which they took many powerful weapons to undermine the strongholds of unbelief. They had no new language to invent—that was much. But what was still more, they had no strange ideas, or unheard-of principles to declare. The system of truth, for the defence and propagation of which they were set, was interwoven with the whole history of their nation; in labouring to establish it, they were only treading in the footsteps, and on a higher vantage-ground maintaining the principles of their

illustrious fathers; in short, they were but the heralds and expounders of a scheme, which gathered into one glorious orb, the many separate and straggling rays of divine truth, which shone from all the dealings and dispensations of God since the world began, and raised it aloft for the healing and joy of the nations. Thus does all Scripture furnish its testimony to the truth as it is in Christ, and Christ himself appeared in "the fulness of time," because the materials required to complete that testimony were now furnished in ample abundance.

CHAPTER IV.

CONSEQUENCES GROWING OUT OF THE VIEWS NOW UNFOLDED FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF PARTICULAR TYPES, AND FORMED INTO SOME GENERAL RULES NECESSARY TO BE OBSERVED IN CONDUCTING INVESTIGATIONS OF THIS NATURE.

It has already been objected to the typological views of the older divines, that their system admitted of no fixed or well-defined rules for guiding us in the interpretation of particular types. Every thing was left to the discretion or caprice of the individual who undertook to explain them. The laying down of a few maxims or canons of interpretation, as was sometimes done, did not alter the case; for these were of necessity too vague and general to provide an effective check on the one hand, or supply a clear directory on the other. That the type must have carried, in its original design and institution, a preordained reference to the gospel antitype—that there is often more in the type than in the antitype, and more in the antitype than in the type—that there must be an appropriate and natural application of the one to the other—that the wicked as such, or any acts of sin as such, must be excluded from the category of types—that one thing is sometimes the type of different and even contrary things, though in different respects, and that there is sometimes an interchange between the types and the antitype of the names respectively belonging to each:—These rules of interpretation, which are the whole that Glassius and most other writers on the types give for our direction, are manifestly of so obvious and general a nature, that they can go but a short way in helping us to clear our path through the intricacies, which overspread the field of inquiry. They do not so much as touch the main difficulties of the subject, and bring no light for the discovery of its leading and essential features. This is just what might have been expected. The rules could not possibly be precise and definite, when the system, on which they were founded, was altogether loose and indeterminate. The foundation was never well

laid, and the directions for building on it were consequently of little value,—without depth or point,—obvious generalities, which were alike incapable of promoting sound inquiry, or of restraining fanciful conjecture.

We are far from pretending to master every difficulty connected with the practical management of the subject, and reducing it all to clear and undoubted certainty. No one will expect this, who rightly understands its nature, and considers either the vastness of the field over which it stretches, or the peculiar character of the ground which it embraces. How many difficulties still remain connected with the interpretation of particular prophecies! What different views, even, may be rightfully entertained concerning them! And yet what can be more conclusively settled, than the general principles of prophetical interpretation, and the events, whether past or future, which many of them foretell! But if prophecy present such a mixture of clearness and obscurity, of doubt and certainty, how much more may the same be expected in the still more difficult and complicated subject of types? That there will be particular cases, in which it is doubtful whether they really are typical, or, if they are, what is their precise typical import, need not be questioned. It will be enough, for the present, at least, if the way is distinctly ascertained and marked out, for reading what may be termed the broader and more important lines of the system.

I. The first conclusion or principle we shall lay down, has reference simply to the extent of typical matter in ancient Scripture, —it is, *that nothing is to be regarded as typical, which is of an improper and sinful nature.* This has just been mentioned as one of the too general and obvious directions, which philological writers have been accustomed to give upon the subject. It is indeed so much of that character, that though in itself a most important and necessary rule to be observed, yet we should have conceived any express or formal announcement of it here unnecessary, were it not that, in popular discourses at least, violations of it are sometimes to be met with even in the present day.

The ground of this rule lies in the connexion, which the type has with its antitype, and consequently with God. The antitype being of God's appointment, and of the things which belong to his everlasting kingdom, the type, which was intended to foreshadow, and prepare the way for it, must also have been of his appointment, and, whether a symbol in religion or a fact in providence, must have been of the things, which he has at least sanctioned and approved. A pre-ordained connexion, such as of necessity existed between the corresponding parts of the earlier and the later dispensations, could not imply less than this. And that being the case, nothing of course admitted into religion, or permitted to have a place in providence, contrary to the mind and will of God, could by possibility be endowed with a typical character. So far, indeed, as the services of religion are concerned, the principle is readily acknowledged; and no one that we are aware

of, either in former or in present times, has thought proper to reckon the false rites of worship, which God's ancient people sometimes adopted among the things which typified the blessed realities of the gospel.

But there is not the same ready and general perception of an incongruity in admitting to the rank of types actions or circumstances in providence, which, though permitted by God to take place, were yet equally opposed to his righteous will with corruptions in worship. God may overrule, and doubtless often has overruled these, for the accomplishment of his own purposes; and, indeed, he never did so more conspicuously, than when the operation of all malice and wickedness, which manifested itself against the blessed Redeemer, was constrained to issue in the infliction of those very things, which "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" had before appointed to be done. That, however, is a very different thing from such acts and counsels being adopted by him as in any proper respect the out-goings of his will, or the indications of his mind. And it were equally unwarrantable to ascribe to his interference, or identify with his name and authority, things done in a sinful course of procedure, as things wrongfully and in a spirit of gross idolatry received into the services of religion. Nor could the question in either case be at all affected by any circumstances connected with the time when, or the person by whom, the things might be done. No period of the church's history, however grand or perilous, and no individual belonging to her, however high in place or holy in character, could ever have the effect of so changing the essential nature of things, as to obtain the sanction and appointment of Heaven for an iniquity in behaviour or an impurity in worship. And as amid the transactions of gospel history, where the antitype comes into play, we exclude all that properly belonged to man's ignorance or sinfulness, so amid the transactions of Old Testament history, where the materials of type are to be found, we must, in like manner, exclude all that had its source in the polluted fountain-head of human depravity. Whether type or antitype, it must be something worthy of God, and bearing, not only the impress of his character, but also the seal of his authority.

This principle, which will scarcely be disowned by any one who brings his mind seriously to contemplate the subject, is much less frequently traversed now, than it once was. Yet there are to be found occasional violations of it both in popular discourses, and in works which, if not of very recent date, are still in current circulation. Thus we are told, by a certain author, of Jacob, "that his receiving the blessing from his father in the garments of Esau, which his mother arrayed him with, may be viewed as a faint shadow of our receiving the blessing from God in the garments of Jesus Christ, which all the children of the promise wear. It was not the feigned venison, but the borrowed garments, that procured the blessing. Even so we are not blessed by God for our good works, however pleasing unto him, but for the righteousness of our Re-

deemer," &c.* What is this but to sanctify Jacob's fraud, and make his worst crime the real ground of the interest he obtained in the peculiar blessing of Heaven? To give such a hallowed air to his misconduct, and bring the highest purposes of God into such near contact and alliance with man's depravity, is in the worst sense to confound light with darkness, and destroy the essential distinctions that must ever subsist between the artifices of sin and the principles of holiness. It proceeds, besides, upon mere superficial resemblances, to the misunderstanding of the real facts of the case. For it was manifestly not Jacob's practising upon his father's infirmities, either with false venison or with borrowed garments, that procured him the blessing. Doubtless these led his father to pronounce it; but what had been thus spoken under the misleading influence of a gross imposition, might surely have been recalled, when the imposition was detected. Is any man, especially one who is called to utter the mind of God, to be held irrevocably bound by what has escaped him in such circumstances? Unquestionably not: and if there had been nothing more in the matter, than the mock venison and the hairy garments of Esau, the word of blessing would speedily have been recalled, and the curse, which Jacob dreaded, substituted in its place. The truth is, Isaac was in error in what he intended to do, as well as Jacob in beguiling him to do what he did not intend. He was going to thwart the purpose of God concerning his children, already intimated to their parents with sufficient plainness even before their birth. They were then informed by an oracle from heaven, that the younger was to be emphatically the heir of blessing. And the fact was abundantly confirmed by the spirit which respectively discovered itself in the two children, as they grew to manhood;—the elder manifestly becoming a man of gallantry and pleasure, sensual and worldly, mindful only of his present comfort, and regardless of the future,—the younger, on the other hand, as manifestly becoming a man of faith and piety, alive to the value of God's blessing, and falling into transgression only from his disposition to grasp at this by wrongful and improper means. Their venerable father, having experienced little, any time, of the trials of faith, and in his declining years giving way to a luxurious ease, which was assiduously ministered to by the delicate food, constantly brought to his hand by Esau, suffered himself to overlook these plain indications of the real standing of the two sons, and of Heaven's counsel regarding them. He had allowed the pleasures and affections of nature so to blind him to the purposes of grace, that he meant, in God's name, to bestow the blessing on him, whom God's word and his own behaviour had plainly excluded from it. But when he saw, how God had allowed him to be misled by the fraudulent transaction of Jacob, and to bestow the blessing otherwise than he intended, then the truth rushed upon his mind; "he trembled exceedingly," not merely on account of the imposition, which had

* M'Ewen on the Types, p. 52. So also Guild, in his Moses Unveiled, and several of our older authors.

been practised upon his blindness, but on account of the far worse blindness, which had beguiled him into the thought of doing, what would have contravened the declared will of Heaven; and therefore, even when he told with what deceit Jacob had obtained the blessing, he added with the strongest emphasis, "Yea, and he shall be blessed."

Thus, when we look at the real circumstances of the case, we find no proper resemblance between them and the method of a sinner's justification before God. It was not the fraud of Jacob in using his brother's garments, nor was it Isaac's mistake regarding these, which actually procured the blessing; and there could not possibly exist, therefore, any ordained connexion between them and the righteousness of Christ, or between the manner of Jacob's entering on the blessing, and that of a sinner's justification. The same want of a real connexion might be proved to exist in regard to every sinful transaction, which has been made to typify something apparently similar under the gospel. For in none is the resemblance more than apparent, and in all, the principle, which respectively pervades the two transactions, must be essentially different. This is now, however, so generally understood, and so few departures from it occur in writings of the present day, that it were needless to enter more at large into the subject. But it may not be improper to remark, that the ground, on which sinful acts and operations are rejected from the number of types, extends also to the natural and immediate consequences of these. The circumstances into which a person gets, or the line of policy he is led to adopt, simply in consequence of having fallen into some transgression, though not in themselves to be reprobated as sinful, are yet so obviously disconnected from God as to any expression of his mind, or revelation of the principles, on which he acts in the dispensations of grace, that to regard them as containing prophetic intimations of the good things to come in Christ, would be to invest them with an importance and relationship to God they were far from possessing. Thus, to refer again to the case of Jacob, his exile from his father's house, his lonely and destitute condition, while he went to sojourn in the foreign land, where he was to find a temporary abode, his taking for his pillow a stone in the neighbourhood of Luz, &c., were just the obvious results of his flagrant iniquity in provoking the vengeance of an ungodly brother; he was in the pitiable condition of a culprit fleeing for his life, and the hard necessities, through which he passed, were not the immediate and proper expressions of divine principle on the part of God, excepting as the manifestations of God's displeasure on account of Jacob's iniquity. On a most solemn occasion he had acted the part of a wicked man, and he was made to know by the calamities which followed, that it was ill with the wicked—that if he was guilty of backslidings, even for a pious object, these backslidings would certainly reprove him. Yet, in a late work on the types, we find Jacob's withdrawment from his father's house viewed as a prophetic representation of Christ's leaving the Father's bosom and

coming as a stranger to the earth—Jacob's being obliged to sleep in the open field, with nothing but a stone for his pillow, as a type of Christ's voluntary humiliation to the lowest depths of poverty and shame, on account of which he was exalted—and even the stone, on which the weary and disconsolate patriarch rested his head, and which he afterwards anointed with the oil of gladness, is made to prefigure him who is the corner-stone of his church, the Messiah, or anointed one.* What a confounding of things that differ! Two series of events strung together, as if one character belonged to them, because the same language is partly applicable to both, but to the utter disregard of the grounds and principles connected with them! It is not the part of an enlightened faith, but of an unregulated fancy, to delight in such superficial, unmeaning combinations; and it would require something more than what the author hints at—the repudiation of neology—to make such interpretations of the word of God be received as the dictates of soberness and truth.

We can conceive it to be objected to the principle laid down under this head, that in one place (1 Cor. x. 6, 11,) the apostle, referring to the murmurings and rebellions of the Israelites in the wilderness, affirms the things, which took place regarding them, to have been types or ensamples to us. It is in reality, however, a confirmation of what has been advanced. For the apostle carefully distinguishes between the human and the divine—between the sinful transactions, which were man's, and the retributions of judgment, which were God's. It is the latter alone, as being an expression of the divine mind, and embodying an unalterable principle in the divine government, to which he gives the name of *types*. He says it was, not the things, which they *did*, but the things, which *happened to them*, that were for ensamples; and he extracts the essential principle they were designed to bring out on the theatre of earthly events, for the special behoof of the members of Christ's spiritual kingdom, by speaking of them as done "to the intent that we should not lust after evil things."

It is possible, however, to exercise an undue and excessive caution in the application of this principle of interpretation. For though it is to confound the things, which essentially differ, to suppose that the forbidden works and operations of sin, could ever be converted into the accredited means for symbolizing or foreshadowing the realities of salvation; yet, as all the manifestations of truth have their corresponding and antagonist manifestations of error, it is perfectly warrantable and just to regard the form of evil, which in certain cases stood counter to the type, as itself the type of something similar, which should afterwards arise as a counter form of evil to the antitype. As one instrument or action of holy principle may represent and foreshadow another, so one instrument or action of sin may in particular situations represent and foreshadow another. Thus, while Sarah typified a church in

* Kanne's Christus in Alten Testament, Th. 11. p. 133, 154, 157.

the full enjoyment of the freedom and privileges of the gospel, Hagar, who had no divine spiritual connexion with Abraham, though admitted to a near outward relation to him, typified a carnal church, in bondage to the elements of the world, and capable only of bringing forth children after the flesh. Thus also the Israelites, the elect seed, typified the spiritual church of the New Testament, all the members of which are elect, according to the foreknowledge of God; and in the hostile relation occupied towards them at different times, by such powers as Egypt, Edom, Assyria, and Babylon, we cannot but see the type of a similar relation held by enemies of the truth towards the Christian church. In strictness of speech it is the one class of relations alone, which is appointed and ordained by God; but as according to the natural course and order of providence, the things belonging to that serve to call into existence those of an opposite character belonging to the other, the latter may also be regarded as having a kind of fixed and ordained connexion. Types of this nature stand much on the same footing as the prophecy of Caiaphas, concerning Christ's death, (John xi. 50,) which, as meant and designed by him, was spoken in bitterest malice, and with the worst intention, but still was a word put into his mouth by God, who used him as an unconscious instrument for declaring the divine will. It was, therefore, a prophecy, for prophecies are "simply words of God put into the mouths of men, who sometimes prophesied without foreseeing it; sometimes again without knowing it; and sometimes even without being willing to do it."* In like manner the various forms and manifestations of evil, with which the church of God in ancient times had to contend, though in itself the offspring of wicked and forbidden malice, was yet allowed by God, and directed by him into the particular form it assumed, with a view, not merely to the trial of the church then being, but also to the instruction and warning of the church in future times, regarding similar trials yet to come.

II. We pass on now to a second conclusion, which is, that the existence and meaning of particular types is to be ascertained, *not from the light possessed by the ancient worshippers concerning their prospective fulfilment, but from the light thrown on them by the great truths and realities of the gospel.*

Whether we look to the ritual or historical types, neither their own nature, nor God's design in appointing them, could warrant us to draw any very determinate inference respecting the insight which the Old Testament worshippers might have into their prospective or gospel import. The one formed part of the religion, the other of the providential dealings of God; and in that point of view it is proper, and necessary, indeed, to inquire what truths they imbodied, or what lessons they taught for those, who were primarily interested in them. It was their fitness for unfolding such truths and lessons, for the time then present, which formed

* Gaussen on Inspiration, p. 376. Eng. Trans.

the ground-work, as we have seen, of their typical connexion with gospel times. But though they must have been understood in that first aspect by the ancient believers, it does not follow that this secondary and ultimate reference must also have been understood; nor does the reality, or the precise import of their typical character, at all depend upon the fact of its having been perceived, or the extent to which it was perceived by those ancient believers. The connexion they implied between the Old and the New Testament dispensations, was not of the church's forming, but of God's; and the greater part, if not the whole of the design, which they had to serve with the Old Testament church, may possibly have been accomplished, with the knowledge of their prospective, but simply by their immediate and primary reference. In their further and prospective reference, that is to say as types, they were just a concealed prophecy—*concealed*, because the events and institutions, in which they consisted, had a certain use and significance by themselves, apart altogether from any respect they bore to the future purposes of God. Now we are expressly told, in regard even to those prophecies, which were *not concealed*, but which spoke in plain and undisguised terms of Christ, that not only the persons to whom they were first addressed, but the very individuals, by whom they were indited, did not necessarily understand their meaning, and had diligently to search for any measure of light they possessed, concerning them, (1 Pet. i. 12.) That the Old Testament prophets must have fully understood the meaning of the predictions they uttered, and that the writers of the New Testament understood and applied their predictions in a different sense, when they gave them a Christian interpretation, were the two groundless assumptions, on which the infidels of the last century based one of their most plausible arguments against Christianity. The falsehood of the assumptions has been repeatedly and thoroughly exposed; and that of the first was declared by the Apostle Peter in the passage just referred to. The prophets were not properly the authors of their own predictions, but spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and whatever knowledge the prophets themselves possessed of the events foretold, so far from being necessarily involved in the mere exercise of the prophetic gift, it required in their case, as well as in that of private individuals, to be obtained by subsequent inquiry and direction. *Their* knowledge, therefore, of the real meaning of the prophecies they uttered, was an entirely separate thing from the prophecies themselves; it was neither indispensable to the existence of these, nor conclusively fixed their import. The prophecies would have stood precisely as they were, though no particular information had either been sought or found respecting them by the persons, who were employed to declare them. And this being the case, in regard even to the *verbal and direct* prophecies, how preposterous would it not be to make the insight of the Old Testament believers into the purport of the typical, or what may be called the *indirect and veiled* prophecies, the ground and measure of the truth concerning them? In both

cases alike, it is the mind of God, not the discernment or faith of the Jewish worshipper, which we have properly to do with.

Yet obvious as this seems, it was generally overlooked by the older divines. They are constantly telling us, not only how Christ was prefigured in the transactions and services of the Old Testament, but also how men looked through these, in the exercise of faith, to Christ and the things of salvation. Thus, one affirms of Adam, "that he believed the promise concerning Christ, in whose commemoration he offered continual sacrifice; and in the assurance thereof, he named his wife Eve, that is to say, *life*, and he called his son Seth, *settled*, or *persuaded in Christ*."* Kanne, in like manner, affirms, that Zipporah, in what she spoke, Ex. iv. 26, "announced through one of her children, the Jehovah as the future Redeemer and Bridegroom."† Even the judicious Edwards speaks of Moses turning aside to see the great sight of the bush burning, yet not consumed, "*because* the great mystery of the incarnation and sufferings of Christ was there represented,—a great sight he might well call it, when there was represented, *God manifest in the flesh*, suffering a dreadful death, and rising from the dead."‡ And Owen, speaking of the Old Testament believers generally, says, "Their faith in God was not confined to the outward things they enjoyed, but on Christ in them, and represented by them. They believed that they were only resemblances of him and his mediation, which, when they lost the faith of, they lost all acceptance with God, in their worship."§ It is not merely the old writers, however, who speak so determinately of the spiritual foresight of the ancients, and make that occasionally, at least, the ground and measure of the truth contained in the types. Warburton, it is well known, is at great pains to prove, that the transaction of Abraham's offering up his son Isaac, was a typical or prophetical vision, done on purpose to represent to his view, the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ, maintaining, in his usual style, that there can be no right understanding of the matter, excepting on this supposition.‖ In this also Graves and Faber concur, the latter of whom asserts, that Abraham must have "clearly understood the nature of that awful transaction, by which the day of Christ was to be characterized, and could not have been ignorant of the benefits about to be procured by it."¶ And to mention no more, Chevallier expresses himself as doubtful about receiving the ordinance of the brazen serpent into the number of the historical types, on the ground of its "not being plainly declared, either in the Old or the New Testament, to have been ordained by God purposely to represent to the Israelites, the future mysteries of the gospel revelation."**

* Fisher's Marrow of Modern Divinity, p. 1. ch. 2.
† Kanne Christus in Alt. Test. 1. p. 100.
‡ History of Redemption, Period 1. Part IV.
§ Owen on Heb. viii. 5.
‖ Divine Legation of Moses, B. VI. T. 5.
¶ Treatise on the Three Dispensations, Vol. II. p. 57.
** Historical Types, p. 221.

The quotations show how current the opinion has been, and still is, that the persons, who lived among the types, must have perfectly understood their typical character, and that by *their* knowledge in this respect, we are bound in great measure, if not entirely, to regulate ours. Now it is a very difficult question, and one toward the settlement of which we can in no case make more than a probable conjecture, how far the events typified, even by the most important symbols and transactions of Old Testament times, were distinctly perceived by any individual, at any period, before their actual accomplishment. The reason of this is, the same with that which has been so admirably applied by Horsley, to the refutation of the infidel objection, in the closely related field of prophecy. It was necessary, for the very ends of prophecy, that a certain disguise should remain over the events it foretold, till they became facts in providence, and therefore, "whatever private information the prophet might enjoy, the Spirit of God would never permit him to disclose the ultimate intent and particular meaning of the prophecy."* Types being just a species of prophecy, so far as they bore respect to the events of gospel history, must have been placed under the veil of a certainly not inferior disguise; whatever insight believers might have had into their ultimate design, they could not be permitted to put that on record; it could only serve, at the very most, as a light for their own encouragement, but not for our direction; and whether it might be full or defective, whether vague and general, or minute and particular, we should not be bound, even if we knew it, to abide by its measure; for here, as in the case of the prophets, the judgment of the early church "must still bow down to time as a more informed expositor."†

That the sincere worshippers of God, in former ages, especially inquiring and believing Israelites, were acquainted, not only with God's general purpose of redemption, but also with the leading principles and results involved in it, we not only admit, but take it as one of the more prominent points, which it is our business to unfold. Indeed, it is impossible to read some of those portions of Old Testament scripture, which disclose the views and feelings of particular believers, concerning their spiritual condition,—to hear David, for example, bewailing his foul disease, expressing the horrors of his soul under a sense of guilt, imploring and obtaining forgiveness, even when sacrifices and burnt-offerings were of no avail, nay, being washed even as with hyssop,—without being convinced, that the enlightened and believing mind must have had some apprehension of the higher things of that salvation, which was preparing for all flesh. At the same time it may well be doubted, if, in the case even of the most favoured worshippers, the mere symbolical institutions of worship, could be any further serviceable, as means of instruction, than that through them were continually brought out and impressed upon the mind, certain

* Horsley's Works, Vol. I. p. 271. † Ibid. p. 273.

great ideas and principles respecting the condition of men, sin and holiness, the purposes and character of God, as connected with the final deliverance and well-being of his people. Believers must have felt, that the ideas and principles in question, were but feebly and inadequately provided for in the outward and carnal services of the worship then established, and must consequently have expected a much loftier exhibition of them in "the age to come," though by what precise objects and events, they could not properly understand, at least not till prophecy had uttered some of its more lucid and circumstantial predictions.

"To the Jewish worshipper," says Davidson,*—and such a worshipper, it must be remembered, had many advantages over those, who lived before the introduction of the law,—"to the Jewish worshipper, his rites of offering, lustration, and sacrifice, presented perpetually the idea, that some medium of purification and atonement was necessary to him, in his service, whether of practice or worship. This was an idea obtruded upon him by the frequent and indispensable exaction of such rites. In the next place, I argue, that the insufficiency of these appointed means of approach to God, their insufficiency in respect of the soul and conscience, would become more truly felt and understood, in proportion to the piety, seriousness and probity of mind, of the individual worshipper; and that God designed to make them a vehicle of this instruction, concerning their own inutility and inefficacy to the great purposes of pardon and acceptance. The majesty of God could not be propitiated, the sanctity of his moral law could not be satisfied, by the appointments in being; they were too weak for those ends, being an institution 'for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, *that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience.*' Their imperfection, indeed, is confessed; but what I think may be inferred, is, that it could not be unknown to the Jewish disciple, if he were studious to consult his conscience, and explore the revealed character of God and his law.

"For the moral law prescribed great and substantial duties,—duties of love to God and man; it was a rule of precept and discipline to the conscience; it fixed the essential principles of good and evil; and gave a strong commanding conviction of the demerit and penalties of sin. 'By the law is the knowledge of sin.' It created more terrors than the ceremonial could relieve. For to the greater transgressions of the moral code, the ceremonial offered no visible relief whatever; it stood aloof from them; and this open chasm in its provisions, duly considered, might conspire with the sense of its general insufficiency, to set men upon some wish or secret inquiry, after another more efficacious mode of atonement, than was to be had by the ordinances of a Levitical worship; or if it could not prompt the idea of such an unseen atonement, might yet dispose to the acceptance of it. The action of the moral and

* Davidson on Prophecy, p. 142.

ceremonial law combined, I conclude, therefore, to have been such as would produce, in reasonable and serious minds, that temper, which is itself eminently Christian in its principles; viz. a sense of demerit in transgression, a willingness to accept a better atonement, adequate to the needs of the conscience, if God should provide it, and a desire after inward purity, which bodily lustration might represent, but could not supply; in short, that temper, which David has confessed and described, when he rejects his reliance upon the legal rites: 'For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it thee; thou delightest not in burnt-offerings.—Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts; and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom.' In which state of mind produced, as I understand it to have been, by the instruction of the law, there is such a preparation made for a Christian faith, although it is clear there was no distinct perception of the Christian *object* of faith, that we cannot reasonably doubt the penitent of the law, would have been the devout disciple of the gospel, had God been pleased to reveal to him the real sacrifice of propitiation which the law did not provide, and thereby the pardon and acceptance, which the penitent so earnestly desired."

We have given this passage at length, because we conceive the views, which it unfolds on this subject, sound and correct in principle—although limiting too much, we apprehend, the amount of knowledge or clearness of view, which might have been attained by the ancient believer. It does not sufficiently take into account the fact, that prophecy from the first was accompanied by the institutions of a symbolical worship, which from their very nature had respect to another redemption from the guilt and ruin of sin than was then realized, and derived from the prospect of that the reason of their appointment. Admitting this, however, in its fullest extent, we are not warranted to affirm, that there could be no acceptable approach to God, unless the worshipper in making it had distinctly in view the coming transactions of the gospel—if only he came in the exercise of such feelings as his own circumstances and the appointed acts of worship required of him. At the same time, it is scarcely conceivable that men of real faith and discernment in the things of God should have got no farther than to be conscious of a guilt, which the law did not adequately provide for, and to be ready to receive a commensurate atonement, *if God should provide one.* A method of deliverance, proceeding on the accomplishment of some glorious work of righteousness, or satisfaction to the offended holiness of God, must have been, as we hope to show in our second part, the great object of hope to intelligent and thoughtful believers, from the very institution of a symbolical worship. But that their views concerning it must have been very vague,—and that their standing as believers, or their acceptance as worshippers, did not depend upon the clearness of their discernment respecting the person and mediatorial work of Christ, is certain, not only from the nature of their situation, as that of men living

in the nonage of the world, but also from the express declarations of New Testament scripture. It necessarily results from the purpose of God to deal with the world at large in the matter of redemption as an individual whose history was to admit of the successive stages of infancy, youth, and ripened manhood, that the earlier periods must have been very limited in knowledge concerning the work of salvation, as well as the other privileges of grace, compared with what was to be afforded to "the ends of the world." Those, who lived even in the earliest, if children of God, must certainly have possessed the elements of the Christian state and character, just as the child possesses the elements of thought and feeling, which are to distinguish his future manhood, (and, in proof of this, see ch. II. and also what is said at p. 60, on the book of psalms.) But for clearness and comprehension of view regarding the things, which properly belong to the condition of manhood, the one must have been equally deficient with the other. Accordingly we are told, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet manifest during the first tabernacle, (Heb. ix. 8,) that is, was not laid clearly open to the view of God's people: and of the things, which are now plainly revealed to us by the Spirit of God, the things unquestionably of Christ and his salvation, it is written that "eye had not (previously) seen, nor ear heard them, nor had they entered into the heart of man," (Isa. lxiv. 9, 1 Cor. ii. 9.) Besides, the history of our Lord's earthly ministry presents us with various, undoubted instances of persons, who, while they were declared to be true children of God, and consequently possessed of the elements of a Christian condition, evidenced very great ignorance and misapprehension of the nature of that redemption, which was the object at once of Christ's mission into the world, and their own earnest expectation. Thus Nathanael was pronounced "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile," while he was evidently labouring under very inadequate views of the person and work of Christ. And no sooner was Peter solemnly declared to be pre-eminently blessed of the Father for his faith in Christ, than he betrayed how much he was surprised and confounded at the mention of Christ's sufferings and death. Such things happening at that advanced stage of the world's history, on the very eve of the new dispensation, puts it beyond dispute, that they may also have happened, if they did not form the general rule, in the earlier ages of the world.

Now this being the case concerning the people of God in ancient times, it would manifestly be travelling in the wrong direction to make the knowledge they possessed of the import of particular types, the measure and standard of ours. The events of providence and the institutions of worship, which constitute the types, had an end to serve independently of their typical design—an end, which they were fitted to serve merely as parts of the current providence, or existing worship of God. Their more remote and typical design was for us, even more than for those, who had primarily to do with them. It could not be materially affected either by the depth and accuracy, or by the dimness and imperfection of the knowledge

concerning it. Our guide, therefore, to the interpretation of the types, must be sought in the writings of the new covenant, rather than of the old; "it is Christ who holds the key of the types, not Moses;" and instead of making every thing depend upon the still doubtful inquiry, what might pious men of old be able to descry of gospel realities through the shadowy forms of typical representations; we must go for instruction to these realities themselves, and by the light reflected from them learn the full and proper meaning of those preparatory arrangements, which, when thus viewed, are seen to be the "testimony of Jesus."*

III. But if in this respect we have comparatively little to do with the views of those, who lived under former dispensations, there is another respect, in which we have much to do with them. And my next principle concerning the interpretation of the types, is, that our first care must be to *make ourselves acquainted with the truths or ideas involved in them, merely as providential transactions or religious services*—to make what they were in their immediate relation to their patriarchal or Jewish worshipper, the ground and matter of what, as typical, they are now to the Christian.

There is no contrariety between this principle and the one laid down in the preceding observation. The substance of what was there maintained is, that the respect, which the providential arrangements and instituted worship of God bore to the facts of the gospel, is for *our* discernment, much more than it could be for theirs, who lived under the darker dispensation; and that the proper method for ascertaining the reality and the nature of the typical connexion, which subsists between the one and the other, is not to reason downward from the earlier to the later, but rather upward from the later to the earlier—from the fully developed truths and objects

* For some striking and important remarks on this subject, see the Works of Robert Hall, vol. II. pp. 204—214, although they are liable to the same exception already brought against the quotation from Davidson, of not taking sufficiently into account the evident reference, which both prophecy and a symbolical worship from the first bore to a higher redemption than was then provided, and which it shall be our object to unfold in the second part of this volume. "That the ceremonial law," he says, "was a prefiguration of good things to come, and owed its validity and efficacy entirely to the analogy which it bore to the true sacrifice, is placed beyond all reasonable controversy. All that is contended for is, that the reference which it bore was not understood, during the subsistence of that economy; that it is not to be considered as an interpretation of the doctrine of the atonement, so much as a sort of temporary substitute for that discovery; and that it was a system of ciphers or symbols, the true interpretation of which was reserved to a future period. It is no more essential to the existence of a type, that its import be understood before it is verified, than it is essential to prophecy, that its just interpretation be comprehended before it is fulfilled." He should rather have said, that the reference was not *fully* understood, nor the just interpretation in either case *clearly* perceived. For *some* measure of light respecting the design and import both of type and prophecy, was necessary, we apprehend, for these accomplishing the end for which they were given. Had they not *seemed* to point to something to come, and kept alive hopes of a greater deliverance and a better inheritance than any thing then afforded to the church, they could not have been fitly adapted to the purpose of a preparatory dispensation. And the palpable contrariety between the spirituality of the law, and the low and carnal nature of its sacrificial institutions, which appeared to have respect only to the body, must, especially when viewed in connexion with the whole course of God's dealings, have forced on enlightened worshippers the conviction of another provision being yet to be made for the guilt and ruin of sin.

of the gospel, to the preparatory forms and exemplars of these, provided in former arrangements of God. What we now affirm is, that the religious truths and principles, which were embodied in the typical events and institutions as immediately affecting those who took part in them, must form the ground and matter of that prospective bearing, which they also had on the affairs of Christ's kingdom. Their typical import is not something apart from their natural and immediate design, but consisting of that and growing out of it. That they had a moral, political or religious end to serve in regard to the time then present, so far from destroying their fitness for typifying the spiritual things of the gospel, constitutes the very ground and reason of their doing so. And therefore their character, in the one respect, must not only be well understood, but taken as the basis of its just interpretation in the other.

This principle of interpretation is so essentially connected with the views already opened up and illustrated in the preceding parts of this treatise,—especially in chapters second and third,—that it would be superfluous labour to discuss the grounds of it anew. The justness of it must stand or fall with the soundness of the view, which has been there exhibited, regarding the nature of the relation that subsists between type and antitype. That relation we have endeavoured to show, lies not in mere outward and superficial resemblances, but in the very essence of the things related,—in their being embodiments of the same ideas and principles, though in the case of the type on an inferior scale of circumstances and interests, and as a designed preparation for that higher manifestation, which was ultimately to be made in the gospel. Both, therefore, must be understood in their true and proper character, before the relation between them can be either intelligently perceived, or correctly traced; and though certainly, it is by the shape and lineaments of the body, that we are chiefly to be guided in discovering the reality and truthfulness of the shadow,—or in plain terms, by the knowledge of the antitype, that we are to assure ourselves of the existence and import of the type,—yet it is obvious, that unless the precise nature and object of the event or institution, which constitutes the type, be distinctly known, the real connexion between that and the antitype cannot be unfolded. So that the question, what elements of divine truth are taught or symbolized in the type? must always go before, and prepare the way for the settlement of this other question,—how did the type foreshadow the coming events and mysteries of the gospel?

It is only by keeping this steadfastly in view, that in the practical prosecution of the subject, we shall be able to direct our thoughts to substantial, as opposed to merely superficial and fanciful resemblances. We shall feel that we have to do with the essences, and not with the accidents of things,—with great truths and principles of government, and not with bare forms and appearances, excepting in so far as these may be the signs and indications of the other. The palpable want of discrimination, in this respect, between what is essential, and what is only accidental,

formed one of the leading defects in our older typological writers. And it naturally arose from their proceeding on the erroneous principle, that all depended upon the knowledge of the antitype; and that the things connected with it being well ascertained, it was perfectly right and proper to regard all similar things under the Old Testament, as possessing a typological relation to it, no matter whether the latter contained any spiritual element akin to the former, or possessed any thing in common with it, besides the external resemblance. Thus, to refer first to an example produced under a former head, Jacob's seeking repose on the plains of Bethel, by laying his head on a stone, may present some faint likeness to the formal act of believers, in resting upon Jesus as the foundation-stone of a redeemed church; but there is no common principle pervading the two. The use, to which Jacob applied the stone, was quite different from that, for which Christ is represented as the elect-stone, that has been laid in Zion,—viz., as affording stability and support to those who are therein; and so far from that needing absolutely to possess the qualities of a stone, (as in the case of Christ, for the purpose he had in view, it had better wanted these, and possessed instead, the softness of a downy pillow. To seek in that incident, therefore, of Jacob's history, a type of Christ in the character referred to, manifests an utter disregard or misapprehension of the real nature of the incident, and invests it with a meaning, which it could not possibly be designed to convey.

Let it be proposed to trace the typical connexion between Christ lifted up on the cross for the salvation of sinners, and the brazen serpent lifted up in the wilderness for the cure of the wounded Israelites. The proposal must of course proceed upon the understanding, the justness of which need not be at present investigated, that the transaction bore a respect to gospel times; and the question would simply be how, or in what respect it did so? I have no difficulty in tracing a striking oneness of principle, and harmony of operations, between the two cases, which completely satisfies all my views and expectations on the subject. I see, in the one case, a people ready to perish temporally, by a mortal wound received into their bodies,—there an object presented to their vision, in itself very unlikely to effect a cure, nay, only the dead copy or exemplar of that living reptile, which had done the evil,—while yet the healing effect does flow from it to those, who obey the divine command by fixing their eyes on the brazen serpent. In the other case, I see men perishing in their souls on account of the destroying power of sin—then an object presented to their faith, the eye of the mind, in itself to all outward appearance most powerless to undo the evil, being but a dying man all enwrapped with sin, just "made sin," in a sense, and for sin smitten to death —but still the blessed effect follows, and all who do indeed look with confidence to that dying Saviour, so far from perishing, obtain everlasting life. Viewed thus in their great leading features, the one case exactly answers to the other; the interests concerned

are widely different, in the former carnal and earthly, in the latter spiritual and eternal, but the methods of dealing or principles of government respectively connected with them are so much the same, that what is found in the one is but the counterpart of what is found in the other. And as confessedly the antitype is far superior to the type, and has many things of importance belonging to it, with which from its very nature the type could have no resemblance, the proper plan in tracing out the connexion, is obviously not to take all that is in the antitype and go to search for something corresponding to it in the type, but on the contrary, to take the essential ideas and principles involved in the type, as we have done above, and as an Israelite himself would have recognised them, and hold it so far, but so far only, typical of the things of Christ's redemption. The essential character and objects of the transaction, in which the type consists, become thus the ground and matter of its typical relation to the realities of the gospel.

But if we should proceed in an opposite direction, and make the essential qualities of the antitype the measure of what we are to expect in the type, then as a matter of course we shall be driven to seek in the latter many trifling and fanciful resemblances, which have no idea or principle in them whatever. This was what our older writers were accustomed to do. And hence we find them dwelling upon the metal of which the serpent was composed, and which, as being of inferior value, has been thought to foreshadow Christ's outward meanness, while its solidity has been taken to indicate his divine strength, and its dim lustre the veil of his human nature.* What was it to the Israelite, we naturally ask, or to the purpose for which it was erected, of what metal it was formed? A dead and senseless thing of itself, might it not as well have been made of wood, or stone, or lead? In such things there was evidently no idea or principle, which an Israelite could conceive as in the least affecting the essential nature of the transaction. And yet, as if it had not been enough to make such unmeaning accidents speak of Christian truth, others were sometimes invented, for which the inspired narrative affords no warrant, to bring the type into fuller correspondence with the antitype; as when Guild represents the serpent, as not having been forged by man's hand or hammer, but by a mould and in the fire, to imagine the divine conception of Christ's human nature; or when Justin Martyr, with still greater license, supposes the serpent to have been made in the form of a cross, the more exactly to portray Christ. Suppose it had, what possible benefit could the subject have derived from the circumstance? Would the serpent in that form have been more effective to cure the diseased? Or would one essential idea, in any respect, have been added to what either an Israelite or a Christian would be otherwise entitled to connect with it? All such puerile extravagances arise from mistaken views of the real character of the relation that subsists between type

* Guild's Moses Unveiled, and Watson's Holy Eucharist, published in 1668.

and antitype, and from consequently proceeding in a wrong manner to investigate that relation in particular cases. They would cease to be thought of, if the principle of interpretation here laid down were strictly adhered to; that is, if the typical matter of an event or institution were first of all viewed as standing in the substantial truths or principles therein taught and symbolized; and if these, after being carefully sought out and considered, were regarded as the whole extent of matter, of which in those instances application is to be made to the events and objects of Christ's kingdom.

The proper and judicious application of this principle will equally serve to the removal of another class of extravagances, which are also very frequent in writers of the Cocceian school, and which in like manner consist of mere external resemblances, originated by the same undue regard to the antitype, and neglect of the moral import or eternal principle in the type, that forms the sinew of its connexion with the antitype. I refer to the division of types, which is generally termed typical persons or characters, in the treatment of which it is customary to run up the points of resemblance between them and Christ to the largest possible number. To instance only in two cases, so many as forty have been reckoned between Moses and Christ, and forty-nine between Joseph and Christ. Of course a great proportion of such resemblances were of a merely outward and superficial nature, and are of no moment whether perceived or not. For any light they throw on divine truth, or any advantage they bring to our faith, we gain nothing by admitting them, and lose as little by rejecting them. What, for example, can it avail to any purpose for which a divine connexion might be formed between the life of Isaac and that of Christ, to be told, that as Isaac was the founder of a mighty state, so is Christ of all the church of God—as Isaac was to be offered alone, the servants being left behind, so Christ had to tread the wine-press alone, his disciples being scattered and fled from him—as Isaac came the third day to the place of his immolation, so Christ came to his sufferings the thirty-third year of his age, consisting of three tens and three units—and much more of a like nature, that may be found in such writers as Guild and Taylor, from whom these are taken?*

It is impossible to avoid the conviction, that in such loose and straggling comparisons, there is no common idea or principle to bind the far distant events together, as parts of one compact and related system. There is nothing but a mere semblance of agreement, which vanishes the moment we take a nearer inspection of the things compared. Such points of resemblance would never have been sought for, had the real nature of the connexion between

* Scarcely any of the later works on the types, published in this country, are free from such conceits regarding personal types. They are to be found, however, in the most extravagant form, in the German work of Kanne, published only in 1818. There the mere similarity of names is held a conclusive proof of a typical connexion. In this way, Miriam, the sister of Moses, was a type of Mary, for the Jews call the former Maria, as well as the latter. The work abounds with such things.

type and antitype been properly understood; nor would typical persons, that is, individuals sustaining a typical character throughout the entire compass of their lives, have ever been supposed to exist. It was to familiarize the church with great truths and principles, not to occupy her thoughts with petty incidents and fanciful analogies, that she was made so long conversant with typical dealings and institutions. And as that end might have been served to some extent by a single transaction in a person's life-time, so, whenever it is served, it is not by any secret personal connexion between the type and the antitype, but by the real and manifest lines of agreement, which the part acted by the one, bore to that acted by the other. In short, it is not properly persons, but divinely appointed actions—not individuals, but works or offices, with the ideas and relations which these were fitted to express, that constitutes the typical matter of this portion of ancient scripture.

To take certain characters, therefore, as a whole, and put our ingenuity to the stretch to trace out every imaginary feature of resemblance in them to Christ, is to take a course, which, as it proceeds upon false views of the subject, cannot fail to lead into much that is puerile and extravagant. In their persons as such, and in the ordinary occurrences of their life, in so far as these did not bear on them the immediate direction and impress of the hand of God, there neither was, nor could be, any divine principle, which connected them with the affairs of his future kingdom. This could only be found in the actions or events, in which by his authority they were called to take a part. And to learn in what respects these did actually typify Christ and his salvation, the most essential step must ever be to ascertain, by careful inquiry, what were the elements of divine truth or obligation in respect to the time then present, which they were designed and fitted to develope. This is the true, the internal thread, which binds together the far distant, but still closely related acts and operations of both covenants, and by a regard to this must all our investigations concerning particular parts of the system be conducted.

IV. Another conclusion flowing not less clearly than the foregoing, from the views already established, and which we would lay down as our next principle of interpretation, is, that while the religious symbol or historical transaction, which is considered typically, has properly *but one radical meaning*, and that to be discovered by contemplating it first of all in its non-typical or primary aspect, yet *the fundamental idea or principle involved in it may often be capable of more than one application to gospel things;* that is, it may bear respect to, and be developed in, more than one department of the affairs of Christ's kingdom.

1. It will be necessary, for distinctness sake, to view the different parts of this proposition in succession. The first part of it asserts the types to be capable of but one radical meaning, or to imbody only one ground-idea—a principle of interpretation most necessary to be kept in view for the clear and profitable investiga-

tion of the subject. By losing sight of this they may be, and indeed have been, made to signify any thing, which the fancy of an individual might suggest, and with vexatious uncertainty to express ideas the most heterogeneous and inconsistent. Thus the deluge has been made by Glassius to typify both the preservation of the faithful through baptism, and the destruction of the wicked in the day of judgment; and the rule under which he adduces this example is, "that a type may be a figure of two, and even contrary things, though in different respects."* In like manner, Taylor, taking the full liberty of such a canon, when interpreting, for example, the passage through the Red Sea as a type of Baptism, sees in that event, first, "the offering of Jesus Christ to their faith, through the red sea of whose death and passion they should find a sure and safe way to the celestial Canaan;" and then this other truth, that by "his merit and mediation he would carry them through all difficulties and dangers, as deep as the bottom of the sea, unto eternal rest."† In this last example the Red Sea is viewed as representing at the same time, and in relation to the same persons, both the atoning blood of Christ, and the outward trials of life. The other example is not quite so palpably incorrect, and indeed does not go to the full length, which the rule it is connected with might have justified; for the action of the waters is considered in it, with reference to different persons, as well as to different respects. It is at fault, however, in making the one event of the deluge typical of two distinct, opposite, and unconnected processes. Many similar examples of a like nature might be produced, especially from what has been written concerning the tabernacle and its services. And if such diverse and even contrary meanings could be legitimately drawn from one and the same action or symbol, though ample scope might thereby be afforded for the exercise of ingenuity, faith could derive from it no satisfactory light or confirmation. The error was just another of the natural consequences of looking too exclusively to the mere form and outward aspect of typical things, which thus appeared capable of being divided and subdivided, turned into any shape or direction, according as the will or purpose of any individual writer might dictate.

The light in which we have endeavoured to exhibit the typical matter of ancient Scripture, removes this prolific source of ambiguity and confusion. For taking that as our guide, the typical transactions and symbols of the old Testament can no longer appear so vague and arbitrary, as to be capable of bearing senses the most various and inconsistent. They were a sort of palpable language, a speaking by action instead of words, and as such, could only accomplish the end they were intended to serve, by expressing certain definite ideas, or uttering an articulate and consistent meaning. Language of this kind, as well as that which is em-

* Philolog. Sac. Lib. II. P. I. Tract. II. sec. 4, § 8. He quotes from Cornelius a Lapide, but adopts the rule from him as good.

† Moses and Aaron, p. 237.

ployed in the ordinary intercourse of life, must necessarily fail of its purpose, if it is so constructed as to be capable of conveying the most diverse, and even opposite senses. We are constrained, therefore, by the very nature of the case, to hold, that whatever instruction God might wish to communicate, either to the earlier or the later church, by means of the religious institutions and providential dispensations of former ages, it must be such as can be read out of them by a mode of interpretation which derives from each part, not a loose and variable, but a fixed and determinate sense. To suppose that any portion of their virtue consists in their power to express manifold and complicated meanings, is to assimilate them to the justly exploded oracles of heathenism. It consists rather in the truth and importance of that one meaning, which, without either vagueness or ambiguity, it was their object to unfold to the church.

2. This is to be understood in the strictest sense of such typical acts and symbols, as from their nature are expressive of a simple, uncompounded idea. In that case, it would be utterly incongruous to make what is but one in the type, flow out into a variety of different and unconnected things in the antitype. But the type itself may possibly be of a complex nature; that is, it may embody a process, which branches itself out into two or more particulars, and thus combines together two or more related ideas. In this case, of course, there must be a corresponding variety in the application that is made of the things in the type to the realities of the gospel; the twofold or threefold idea contained in the one, must have its counterpart in the other, as much as if each idea had possessed a separate representation,—due regard, however, being paid to the connexion, which they may appear to have one with another, as component parts of the same type. For example, the event of the deluge, recently adverted to, which at once carried on its bosom an elect seed, in safe preservation for the replenishing of the new world, and overwhelmed in perdition the race of the ungodly, unquestionably involves a complex idea; it embodied in one act a double process,—a process, however, which in both its parts was accomplished simultaneously, for the doing of the one, brought along with it the execution of the other. In searching, therefore, for the proper antitype in New Testament times, we must have respect, not only to the two ideas themselves severally represented, but also to their relation to each other; we must look for some spiritual process, which in like manner combines a work of preservation with a work of destruction. In the different fates of the righteous and the wicked, the one as heirs of salvation, the other of perdition, we have, no doubt, presented to our view the twofold result in question; but we can scarcely say, that the conditions of the type are thereby fulfilled, unless these results should appear as the operation of a work of God, producing both contemporaneously, and as different parts of the same process. The two events may certainly be so viewed; and that either, first, in the respective heads of the parties, the triumph of Christ over all evil, being the

bruising of Satan's head; or, secondly, in the relation the different followers of each hold to the ultimate appearance of Christ for judgment, when there shall be the manifestation of divine power and glory, at once to exalt the people of God above the reach of temptation and suffering, and appoint his enemies to the doom of irrecoverable perdition. If the typical connexion between the deluge, and God's grander works of preservation and destruction, is viewed in either of these lights, the objection we made above to the interpretation of Glassius will be removed, and the requirements of the type satisfied. Such also is the case, if viewed, as it is by the apostle Peter, in reference to individual believers, as possessing in their own persons the elements of good and evil, which have their wider development in the children of light and darkness at large; for to such, the object and intent of baptism, as ingrafting them into the death and resurrection of Christ, is at once to destroy the old man of corruption with his lusts, and preserve in safety and blessedness of life, the new man of faith and holiness. The connexion, which baptism represents and seals between believers and Christ, secures alike the accomplishment of both processes, and they are so indissolubly conjoined, indeed, that, as in the case of the deluge, the one goes along with the other. In like manner, there are many things connected with the tabernacle-worship,—such as, the numbers used in its furniture and services, the different kinds of sacrifices presented in it, its manifold rites of cleansing, —which are so arranged as to have a complex meaning, and which must, with every variation in the mode and circumstance of their appointment, be expressive of some corresponding change or modification in the ideas symbolized,—yet so that these can never alter their fundamental character, or become expressive in one relation of something totally different from what they did in another. A symbol, no more than a word in written language, can be made to change its meaning at random, but must have its import determined by a due consideration of its own essential nature, and the connexion in which it stands.

3. It is one thing, however, to maintain, that a type, either as a whole, or in its component parts, can express only one meaning, and another, that it may admit of more than one application to the affairs of Christ's kingdom. It has already been shown at large, that the ascription of a typical or gospel reference, to the transactions and symbols of Old Testament history, proceeds, when properly understood, on the ground, not of a double sense, but of such a connexion existing between the earlier and later dispensations of God, that the ideas or principles brought out in those events and institutions on the floor of carnal and earthly things, were designed, while still retaining the same sense, and only viewed as in that sense, prophetic intimations of the future purposes of Heaven, to point to other things of a spiritual and heavenly nature, in which a far higher development was to be given to the same ideas and principles. One can easily conceive, however, that under such a dispensation as that of the gospel, so infinitely varied,

yet so closely related in its parts, there may be more than one department, in which the grand elements of divine truth embodied in the type, find their intended counterpart. The types, as well as the prophecies, may in some respects have "springing and germinant accomplishment." Especially may this be expected, when viewed in respect to that great characteristic of the gospel dispensation, which, from constituting Christ the head and exemplar of all his people, renders it necessary, that their state and experience should grow out of, and be formed after his. The constitution of the kingdom in this respect, is, that while Christ should in all things "have the pre-eminence" over those whom he calls his brethren, yet they should in all be "conformed to his image," and tread in his footsteps. Hence they are spoken of as so thoroughly identified with him, that "they have fellowship with him in his sufferings," "have died with him," and been "made conformable to his death;" that they have been "buried with him into death," "planted in the likeness of his resurrection," "sit with him in heavenly places," and "have their life hid with him in God."* The church also, in her collective capacity as one body, has many things in common with Christ. Indeed, so intimate is her relation to him, that her sufferings are spoken of as his sufferings, and her members as his members;† and it is no more than we might expect, to find in many parts of her history a repetition substantially of what had already taken place in his. Therefore, the principles and ideas, the truths and relations, which through means of typical ordinances and transactions, were so constantly presenting themselves to the eye of the Old Testament church, while they doubtless had their chief and highest development in Christ himself, must also be considered as often likely to re-appear in the history of his church and people; they bear respect to *our* doings and sufferings, experiences and hopes, in so far as these essentially coincide with Christ's; for so far, the one is but a renewal in part, or continuance of the other.

The explanation recently given of the deluge may be viewed as an example of this twofold application, and for another, we may refer to the rite of sacrifice, in what may be called its primary and fundamental aspect. The main idea symbolized by it, as formerly explained, was the giving up the soul or life to God; and it unquestionably had its only complete and perfect fulfilment in Christ. But believers also under him, and by virtue of that spirit of life, which they derive from him, must be ever doing in a degree, what he thus once, and in complete perfection, did for them; they must "present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is their reasonable service." Language so expressly referring to the sacrifices of the Old Testament, could not with propriety be employed of believers now, unless the truth symbolized in those sacrifices were exemplified anew in them, and, indeed, in a higher manner. For the sacrifice here consists in the presenting

* Col. i. 18, Rom. viii. 29, Phil. iii. 10, Rom. vi. 8, 4, 5, Eph. ii. 6, Col. iii. 3.
† 2 Cor. i. 5, Phil. iii. 10, Col. i. 24, 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27.

of men's bodies to God as a "living sacrifice," and the doing of it is named "a reasonable service,"—that is, a spiritual act and exercise of the mind itself, as opposed to a mere outward service performed by the presentation of some extraneous object. It is the dedication of their persons, as now sanctified by the blood of Jesus, and instinct with a new spiritual life derived from him, to the service and glory of God; and though not to be compared, in virtue and completeness, to the one perfect oblation of Christ, yet it manifestly belongs to a higher sphere, than the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament. The same fundamental idea, however, pervades both, and being found representatively, the one in an imperfect and preparatory dispensation, the other in a completed and permanent one, they stand to each other in the relation of type and antitype.

It is proper to add, that the way now mentioned is not the only one, in which the events and institutions of the Old Testament are typical of things belonging to the people of Christ. Not a few of them bear respect to these exclusively and alone. In proof of which, it is enough to refer to the rite of circumcision, to the passage through the Red Sea, and the judgments in the wilderness, all which must obviously have their gospel antitype in the heirs of salvation, not in the spotless Redeemer who purchased it. So that when the apostle writes of the ordinances of the law, that "they were a shadow of good things to come, but the body is of Christ," (Col. ii. 17,) he is not to be understood as meaning, that Christ personally and alone is the ultimate object contemplated by one and all of the ritual services, but Christ together with his body the church,—the events and objects of the gospel dispensation. We find Christ spoken of in this collective sense on other occasions;—as in 1 Cor. xii. 12; Gal. iii. 16. And it is by no means an arbitrary sense; for it is grounded in the deep and important truth, on which we have based the propriety of a twofold application or bearing of typical things,—namely, the oneness that subsists between Christ and his people, he "in them, and they in" him.

V. Another rule of interpretation arising out of the principles already established, and necessary to be borne in mind, if we would give an enlightened and consistent view of typical symbols and transactions, is, that *due regard must be had to the essential difference between the nature of type and antitype.* For as the exhibition of divine truth contained in the former, was given on a lower stage, or by means only of carnal and earthly concerns, in applying the elements of truth, so taught, to the higher, that is, the spiritual and heavenly concerns of Messiah's kingdom, what bore immediate respect to the flesh in the one, must be understood as bearing immediate respect to the soul in the other,—while in the one, temporal interests only appear, their counterpart in the other must be eternal interests; in short, the outward, visible, and carnal in the type, must in the antitype pass into the inward, spiritual, and heavenly.

A change or advance of the kind here supposed, enters into the

very vitals of the subject, as unfolded in the earlier part of our investigations. The reasons why types and symbols were ever introduced into the worship and history of the church, was just the necessity, according to the divine plan, of such a progression being made in the mode of developing the truth, which belongs to Messiah's kingdom. The world was treated as a child, that must be taught great principles, and prepared for events of infinite magnitude and interest, by the help of familiar and sensible objects, which lay fully open to their view, and within the grasp of their comprehension. But now that the things themselves have come, for which the means of preparation were instituted, we must take care, in tracing the connexion between the one and the other, to keep steadily in view the essential difference of the two periods, and with the rise in God's plan make a corresponding rise in the interpretations we put upon his preparatory arrangements. To proceed without regard to this,—to look for the proper gospel manifestation of the fundamental idea disclosed in any particular type, in the same class of objects and interests, as that about which the type was conversant, would betoken a like ignorance of the divine plan, with that which was displayed by those Judaizing Christians, who still clung to the Mosaic ordinances after the better things had come, of which these were but the shadow and image. It would be to remain at the old foundations, while the scheme of God has sprung to a loftier sphere, and laid a new world, as it were, open to our view. If, therefore, we sympathize with the change, which has taken place in the constitution of the kingdom, and make that bear, as it should, on the connexion between type and antitype, we must look for such things in the latter, as, while they resemble, indeed, similar things in the former, bear respect to far higher and more important concerns.

Much discretion, however, which it is impossible to bound by such precise and definite rules, as might meet all conceivable cases, will be necessary in applying the principle now stated to particular examples. In the great majority of cases, there may be no great difficulty, the distinction between the present and former dispensations being so palpable in this respect, as to secure a certain degree of uniformity, even amongst men not remarkable for discrimination. And, indeed, the writers most liable to err on other points, especially by multiplying to excess typical analogies, are least in danger of erring here, because they are for the most part spiritual and enlightened in their views concerning the nature and design of all that pertains to the new covenant. The point in regard to which they are most in danger of erring concerning it, and that which really forms the chief difficulty in applying the principle now under consideration, arises from what may be called the mixed nature of those things, which constitute the antitypes,—the affairs and objects of Messiah's kingdom. As opposed to those, which formed the substance of preceding dispensations, and rising above them, we denominate the realities of gospel truth and experience spiritual, heavenly, divine, eternal. And yet they were not all

disconnected with the flesh and the world. The great centre of the whole, Jesus Christ, not only dwelt in flesh upon the earth, but had certain conditions of an outward and bodily kind to fulfil, which were the subject of prophecy, and may of course have also been that of type. In regard to his church too, the life of faith in her members is not all inward; the history of her experience on earth is not wholly confined to the hidden man of the heart; there are events of an outward and earthly kind—for example, the miraculous operations of the Spirit, the calling of the Gentiles, the evils of persecution, the apostacy and doom of antichrist,—which hold not an accidental, but an essential and determinate place in God's purposes concerning her. And the question naturally arises, may not such temporal and fleshly things have been typified by similar things connected with the Old Testament church? And, if they were, then are not type and antitype made to rest substantially upon the same level? Is not the outward and carnal in the one, after all, viewed as answering to something merely outward and carnal in the other?

A great part of the difficulty here urged, will be removed, if it is understood, that what is meant by the spiritual, divine and heavenly nature of gospel things, is not their utter disconnexion from sense and time, but their direct and immediate connexion with the interests of salvation, with a kingdom not of this world, and a coming eternity. The kingdom of heaven, both in its head and members, while themselves partake of flesh and blood, must have their history to a certain extent bound up with outward and temporal affairs, and the latter, for the very food and exercise of their divine life, are in some degree dependent upon carnal ordinances. But Christ's work was not the less a spiritual work, his kingdom a heavenly kingdom, his salvation an eternal salvation, that, in doing and providing all, he had to endure pains of body, as well as of mind, to be suspended outwardly on a malefactor's cross, as well as to be in his soul exceeding sorrowful even unto death; nor is the life, which his people are called to lead in him, less entitled to be called a spiritual and divine life, that it is maintained upon the theatre of a present world and brings them into contact with its temporal concerns, as well as with principalities and powers of darkness. For the history of Christ's kingdom, even when thus connected, in himself or his people, with outward and visible things, bears immediately upon the highest interests of man's nature, and the progress of the great work of God. Whatever outwardness may belong to any portions of the history, yet if all is viewed in its relation to the spirit, and not to the flesh, to a divine and not to a worldly life, to the blessings of salvation, and not of time, surely the epithets, above mentioned, are perfectly applicable to these portions, and a broad distinction separates them from the acts and operations of former ages, which not only had to do with, but seemed to have their terminating point in the flesh, the world, and the things of time.

This may be made very plain by a few examples. Thus the de-

luge and baptism are both, to a certain extent, of an outward and carnal description; but the kind of life, to which the one ministered, was the life only of the flesh, while in the other it is that of the spirit. The crucifixion of Christ was in itself as much an outward and worldly transaction, as the slaying of the passover; but while the direct object and purpose of the latter was preservation from a temporal judgment, and deliverance from a carnal yoke, those of the other have respect to the curse, condemnation, and bondage of sin. In like manner, the high-priest's going into the holy place, and Christ's ascending into heaven, the immediate dwelling-place of God, was in each case a personal and bodily transaction; but in the one case outward defilements and outward cleansing, in the other inward and moral, were the objects respectively contemplated by these different transactions. Samson's marriage to a Philistine, and Christ's calling the Gentiles, (supposing the one to be typical of the other,) were equally events holding a distinct and palpable place in the world's history, but the one merely for earthly ends and purposes, the other for high and eternal interests. Christ's heritage, as Messiah, is just the whole of that earth, of which Solomon's empire formed a part, and the hope of his church is, that she shall "reign with him upon the earth;" yet while Solomon's dominion was confined to the bodies and temporal interests of his people, Christ's shall pre-eminently respect their souls, and be characterized by "righteousness, and peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost."

It is needless to pursue the contrast farther. But it will be proper to give also a few examples, in which, by a false analogy, our principle of interpretation is violated, and the antitype placed in things of the very same class and order, with those which belong to the type. The supposed conformation of the serpent on the pole, to the figure of Christ on the cross, is manifestly one of that description; for it would have been in each case but a material resemblance, unconnected with the respective purposes for which Christ and the serpent were thus lifted up. So also is the circumstance, sometimes noticed, of Isaac's being circumcised the eighth day, or his bearing the wood for the burnt-offering, as representing the time of Christ's circumcision, and his personally carrying the cross; for the things are precisely the same in kind; there is no advance from a lower to a higher sphere of truth; and in regard to the last, all the ends of Christ's crucifixion might have been served without his having at all participated in such a burden; else, why should Simon the Cyrenian have been allowed to take part in it, and what have we in Isaac's case to prefigure this part of Simon? If the analogy were good for any thing, it must be complete. But the most frequent and pernicious examples of this style of interpretation are to be found in those authors, at the head of whom Grotius may be regarded as standing, who, having low and incorrect views of the leading doctrines of the gospel, endeavour to beat down and emasculate the sense of the passages of the New Testament, which unfold them, by a reference to the facts and

ordinances of the Old Testament. They interpret historically, as it is called, by looking at gospel truth, not only through a Jewish medium, but also in a Jewish sense, and conceiving nothing but externals spoken of in the one, when that was all which appeared in the other. I need not stop to show how far this mode of interpretation has been carried by Socinian writers in this country, and neologians on the continent, regarding all the essential doctrines of the gospel. But there are occasional exhibitions of it, even with authors who belong to an incomparably better school. For example, we find attempts not unfrequently made to explain away the doctrine of election, according to which, certain persons have been chosen by God to eternal life, on the ground, that as election in the gospel sense must be understood with reference to the Old Testament use of the expression, so it cannot mean an absolute election to spiritual and eternal blessings, because as applied to the Jews, it was only their election as a nation to outward privileges and a temporal inheritance.* That, on the contrary, is the very reason why election, as spoken of Christians, *must* connect them with the benefits of salvation, for the proper counterpart under the gospel to those outward things, is the endowments of the Spirit and a heavenly inheritance; for thus only can the type be made to contain a lower, and the antitype a higher development of the truth. Even Macknight, who cannot be charged with undue spiritual leanings, perceived the necessity of thus making "the natural seed the type of the spiritual, and the temporal blessings the emblems of the eternal;" and he consequently regards the outward professing church in the one case, with its election to the earthly Canaan, as answering, in the other, to "the invisible church, consisting of believers of all nations, who partaking the nature of God by faith and holiness are truly the sons of God, and have the inheritance of his children."†

There are, however, two typical explanations in New Testament scripture, and so far as I know only two, which look as if they could not be made to harmonize with the principle, for which we are contending. These are found in two passages of our Lord's history, and will soon be noticed in another connexion, (ch. V. § 1,)—his temporary sojourn in, and recall from Egypt, and the preservation of his bones from being broken on the cross. If that

* See Whitby on Rom. ix. and 1 Pet. ii. 9. Archbishop Whateley, (in his Essays on the Peculiarities of the Gospel, p. 95,) gives the argument a somewhat different turn from Whitby, and represents the Israelites as not having "been elected absolutely and infallibly to enter the promised land, to triumph over their enemies, and live in security, wealth, and enjoyment; but only to the privilege of having these blessings placed *within their reach*, on condition of their obeying the law, which God had given them." Whence he infers that Christians are only elected, in the same sense, to the privileges of a gospel condition and *the promise* of final salvation. The representation proceeds upon a wrong view of the matter, and misses the real points of resemblance. The election and promise *were* made absolutely and unconditionally,—"to thy seed will I give this land,"—and all that can be inferred from many afterwards perishing in the wilderness, is simply that they were not that portion of the seed in whom the election or promise was to stand. Neither did they lose it for disobeying the law, which could never reverse the election, but only for disbelieving the promise.

† Macknight on Rom. ix. 8.

part of Israel's history, which connected them with the land of Egypt, was to find its antitype in Christ, yet surely the whole analogy of typical interpretation would lead us to expect, that by Egypt in his case should be understood, not the actual country which goes by that name, but a state of danger or oppression, such as that really was to the Israelites, when God interposed to bring them out. And not only was Christ's connexion with it of the same worldly or outward kind, as that which the Israelites had held, but it was in some respects entirely opposite, not having been to him at all a house of bondage or affliction, but only a safe retreat from danger in his native land. If he must have been in the literal Egypt like the natural Israel, why should his experience there be so widely different? Was not the resemblance after all in name, more than in reality?—In like manner, the necessity of Christ's legs not being broken, in order that he might resemble the paschal lamb, which was to be presented and eaten entire, seems to point to a merely superficial, and in each case equally external similarity. For why should the breaking of his leg, any more than the piercing of his hands and feet and side, have interfered with the essential correspondence between him as the dying Saviour, and the paschal lamb? Why should the appointed agreement, if including such things, not also have required the shedding of his blood at the neck, and the sprinkling of a portion of that blood on the posts and lintels of the houses?

There is undoubtedly much appearance of force in such objections; yet in the latter case, at least, they are ungrounded, as will be seen, when we come to a particular investigation of the paschal offering and feast. It will then be shown, that there was a deep and important meaning in the unbrokenness of the bones, which required to have its exact fulfilment in Christ, in order that he might be in his death that one sacrifice, which his people needed for their salvation, while no necessity existed for a similar correspondence in regard to the way of shedding and disposing of the blood. The other example is not so easily reconciled to our principles, and yet a careful examination of the matter will be sufficient to remove the appearance of any essential disagreement. Of course the passage, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," could only be regarded as a prophecy waiting for fulfilment in Christ, on the ground that as the natural Israel, God's first-born on earth, was typical of Jesus as the only-begotten of the Father, so it is the principle involved in that of Israel's history, rather than the precise locality with which it was connected, that must be kept in view. The principle was, that Israel, though the first-born of Jehovah, and destined to hold the highest place in the kingdoms of this earth, had yet, at an early period, to seek shelter and struggle for existence as a stranger in a foreign land. This apparent desertion and hardship in the infancy of their political being, was not inconsistent with the singular place they held in God's favour, and the glorious destiny they were afterwards to fill; for when the purposes were fulfilled, for which they were sent there, "God

called his son out of Egypt." So was it with Jesus, the eternal Son of God. His infancy too was enveloped in obscurity and danger; though angels announced his incarnation and heralded his birth, his tender life was ready to be crushed by the murderous hand of a jealous and unprincipled despot; so that a place of secure and distant shelter needed for a time to be provided for him. It might have seemed to the eye of sense, as if, while in that state of exile, he was forsaken of his Father, and had no peculiar interest in the love and counsels of Heaven. But the reverse proved to be the case; for, as with Israel of old, his temporary residence there was itself the fruit of special kindness, and whenever the purpose was accomplished, for which such a measure was adopted, the Lord again "called his son out of Egypt." And as that portion of Israel's history had been found no way to interfere, either with their peculiar relation to God, or the distinguished ends they were to serve in his moral government, neither should this like treatment, when experienced by the Redeemer himself, have staggered the faith of those, who knew and believed him to be the Son of the Highest, but should rather have appeared to them a proof, that he had begun to enter on his marvellous career.

This explanation, which, if admitted, brings the case fairly within the scope of the principle now under consideration, only so far carries a strained appearance, that it assumes Egypt to have been rather accidentally, than from any necessity, connected with the fulfilment of the type, the place of our Lord's temporary sojourn. Any other country might have served the purpose as well, so far as the essential conditions of the type were concerned. But when we think how weak the faith was of those, who were then waiting for the consolation of Israel, and how even an outward resemblance of that nature might help them to realize the connexion here between the type and the antitype, we shall scarcely think it beneath the compassion and wisdom of God, to have so ordered events, that Egypt should have been again chosen as the very place of refuge, and that in fact as well as in principle, in the letter as well as in the spirit, the Son of God should have been again called out of Egypt. I cannot but regard this view of the matter as strongly confirmed by a very similar application made of more than one direct prophecy to Christ. Thus, in Matth. viii. 17, the Evangelist says, his healing the sick and relieving those that were oppressed of the devil, was done, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet,—himself took our infirmities, and bare our sickness." There is a literality and an outwardness in this declared fulfilment, which rather disturbs than satisfies our ideas concerning the import and meaning of the prophecy. For though we should suppose the removal of those outward troubles to have been contemplated in the prophecy as a sort of inferior and secondary object, yet certainly the sense in which Christ took and bore these was not the same, in which he took and bore the spiritual evils, that formed the chief object of his undertaking. May there not, then, have been here an outward and palpable coincidence,

somewhat in the way and for the purpose above mentioned,—not that the mind might rest in that as the whole, but might rather, from feeling the inadequacy of that, rise to the knowledge and apprehension of Jesus, as in the highest sense the bearer of man's burdens? A precisely similar explanation is given by John, ch. xix. 37, of the prophecy of Zechariah, "They shall look on him whom they have pierced," which the Evangelist refers to as meeting with its fulfilment in the actual piercing of Christ's side by the soldier's spear. Yet no one surely can doubt, (if any one can, let him consult Lampe on the passage,) that the whole sufferings of the Messiah were indicated by the piercing. Consequently a more literal and outside fulfilment was given to the prediction, than it could be said properly to require, for the purpose of assisting a weak faith, and rendering the object pointed at by the prophet visible, in a manner, to the eye. To say nothing of other less obvious examples, we simply allude further to that in Matth. ii. 23, where Christ's going to dwell in Nazareth is said to have been done for a fulfilment of what was spoken by the prophets, "He shall be called a Nazarene." What was spoken in this respect by the prophets, is, that he should be a Nezer, a branch or tender sprout of the house of David, pointing to the humble and lowly condition in which he should at first appear, (Isa. xi. 1, liii. 2; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, &c.) The village of Nazareth derived its name from the same circumstance, its relative meanness and inferiority, as compared with the larger and richer places in its neighbourhood. "Not at Jerusalem, where was the seat of his royal ancestors and the throne of his house, did the Messiah fix his abode; but in the most despised city of the most despised province did the providence of God assign his dwelling. The name of this despised city, which implied its lowliness, was the same by which Isaiah had signified the original lowliness of the Messiah himself."* This extremely literal and outside fulfilment could not be regarded as absolutely necessary to establish the word spoken by the prophets referred to; nor could it possibly be the intention of Matthew to represent Christ's residence in Nazareth as either the whole that such prophecies meant concerning him, or what was indispensable to verify their meaning. He is rather to be regarded as pointing to "the coincidence between Christ's name and the place of his residence, as a remarkable external illustration of the exact connexion of prophecy and its fulfilment," which was no doubt done with the view of aiding the faith of God's people, and making more palpable to their minds the fact of Jesus being the person foretold by the prophets.†

* Hengstenberg's Christology, P. II.

† Mr. Alexander, in his Connexion of the Old and New Testaments, gets rid of the difficulties connected with the two passages in Matthew, ("out of Egypt have I called my Son," and "he shall be called a Nazarene,") by first trying to ridicule the explanations which have been given of them, and then conveniently introducing the supposition, that such prophecies were once in existence, but have been lost from the record. He has himself said of the older typological system, that by it "error found a cheap mode of defence;" and we may say of this short-hand discovery of

It is a connexion entirely of this kind, which we conceive to exist in the case of the type now under consideration. What took place in the type, when Israel was called out of Egypt, might have been substantially verified in Jesus of Nazareth, though he had never in person visited that country. It would have met with true and valid fulfilment had he been obliged to take refuge any where from the malice of his enemies, or the troubles of life, during the earlier period of his history. That Egypt was actually chosen as the place of refuge, to which he was for a time sent, and from which he was again recalled, was an external and visible conformity to the inward, spiritual idea, granted in accommodation to the weak faith of believers, and an exception to the general course of God's dealings, rather than an example of it. So that the difficulty, on a nearer view, disappears; and in this respect the closely related subjects of type and prophecy stand on a footing.

CHAPTER V.

THE CONNEXION BETWEEN TYPE AND PROPHECY,—VARIOUS COMBINATIONS OF THE ONE WITH THE OTHER, GIVING RISE TO WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED THE "DOUBLE SENSE OF PROPHECY." THE SUBJECT EXPLAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES ALREADY ADVANCED, FOLLOWED BY SOME REMARKS ON THE VIEWS COMMONLY ENTERTAINED REGARDING IT.

EVERY type necessarily possesses a prophetical character, and differs from what is commonly termed prophecy only in this, that it prefigures, while they foretell, coming realities. The one represents, by means of instructive acts or symbols, what is future, the other predicts it in express terms. The difference is not such as to affect the essential nature of the two subjects, or to prevent us from ranking the typical with the prophetical portions of Scripture, as containing real intimations of future things connected with the gospel, and manifesting in the correspondence of the one part with

non-existent prophecies, that it is a cheap mode of getting rid of difficulties. He will require, however, in carrying out his principle, not only to discover prophecies of which there is no record, but to expunge others, which still have a place on the record. For whatever difficulty attaches to the above passages, viewed as fulfilments of what is written in the prophecies of Isaiah and Hosea, is precisely of the same kind with that which attaches to Matt. viii. 17, comp. with Isa. liii. 4; to John xviii. 9, comp. with ch. xvii. 12; to ch. xix. 37, comp. with Zech. xii. 10; we may also add Matt. xxvi. 31, comp. Zech. xiii. 7; for that the kind of scattering chiefly intended in the prophecy was of a very different kind from that mentioned by Christ, is evident at a glance. In each of these cases, not less than the two above specified, there is an outwardness, and if we may so speak, a shallowness in the alleged fulfilment, which is far from meeting the deep and pregnant meaning of the prediction; yet still a fulfilment so far as it went; and one intended not to lead men to rest in it as the whole, but rather, in condescension to their weak and fleshly minds, to help them, as by the indication of a visible sign or omen, to penetrate into the full and hidden meaning of the prophecy.

the other, the foresight and wisdom of Him who sees the end from the beginning. In distinctness and precision of meaning, however, simple prophecy has greatly the advantage over informations conveyed by type. The former may delineate the future as clearly and circumstantially as history does the past, and in point of fact, some of the sections of ancient prophecy are scarcely inferior in these respects to the evangelical narratives, which record their fulfilment. In regard to the types, on the other hand, however certain we may be of their reference to gospel events, and however satisfactorily we may be able to explain the nature of this reference, yet from having a significance or moral import of their own, apart from any thing prospective, it is evident that the prediction they unfold must be somewhat less transparent and possess more of a complicated character. Still, the relation between type and anti-type, especially if followed out into much detail, may produce as deep a conviction of design and pre-ordained connexion, as can be derived from simple prophecy and its fulfilment, though, from the nature of things, the evidence in the latter case must always be more obvious and palpable than in the former.

But the possession of the same common character is not the only link of connexion which unites together prophecy and type. They not only agree in having both a prospective reference to the future, but they are often also combined into one prospective exhibition of the future. Prophecy, though sometimes, is far from being always, of a simple and uncompounded nature, delineating the future in terms as plain and direct as history delineates the past. In many portions of it there is a certain degree of complexity, if not dubiety, and that often arising, as in the types, from the events and transactions of the past being somehow interwoven with its anticipations of things to come. In saying this, we approach the confines of a great controversy, on which some of the largest minds have expended their talents and learning, and with so much appearance of truth on both sides, that divines are still almost equally divided on the question, whether there is, or is not, a double sense in prophecy? The subject lies so directly across our path, that we cannot avoid handling it, without omitting a most important branch of our typological investigations; and we are further induced to grapple with it, from the persuasion, that the principles already unfolded in the preceding chapters, are capable of being applied, so as to prepare the way for a satisfactory statement of the point at issue. We shall, therefore, first of all make this application to the field of inquiry now stretching before us, proceeding right onward in our course, as if there were no controversy connected with it; and having done this, we shall add a few remarks on the sentiments of those, who hold either side of the question as it is usually stated.

From the similarity of nature existing between types and prophecies, we are prepared to expect, that they may sometimes run into each other,—that what is prefigured in action, may at the same time be found described or predicted in words. And this it

is quite possible to conceive might take place under either of the three following methods. 1. A typical transaction having occurred might be historically described, and hence the description, being that of a prophetical circumstance or event, would come to possess a prophetical character. 2. Or, the essential truths and principles embodied in some typical transaction might be taken up and applied in an accompanying prediction, which at once explained the type, and expressly delineated to the eye of faith the coming reality. 3. Or finally, there might be a typical transaction, not past, but still future, or a line, perhaps, of typical transactions, which, though already begun, stretched considerably onwards, and along with this there might, for important reasons, be coupled a word of prophecy, not describing so much as pre-supposing what was typical, and carrying forward the truths and principles embodied in it to concerns far higher than any thing belonging to it,—the concerns of God's everlasting kingdom. We could manifestly have no difficulty in conceiving these suppositions realized, without any violence being done to the essential nature of type or prophecy, or any derangement being made in their respective provinces,—nothing, in short, happening but what might have been expected from the relation subsisting between the two subjects, and their fitness for being employed in concert to the production of common ends. And we shall now endeavour briefly to show, that the suppositions just made are in precise accordance with the facts of the case.

I. The first supposition is that of a typical transaction historically described, and the description, as being that of a prophetical circumstance or event, coming consequently to possess a prophetical character. There are two classes of Scriptures, which may be said to verify this supposition; one of which is of so general and comprehensive a nature, that the fulfilment is properly confined to no single period, but is constantly recurring. And on this account, the examples belonging to it are commonly viewed as of a different order altogether from the other class, with which we associate them; but improperly, as we conceive, for the difference is not of an essential nature. To this class we refer the words in Ps. lxix. 9: "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up: and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen on me,"—of which the former part is applied specially to Christ; and the latter to him in common with his faithful people, (John ii. 17, Rom. xv. 3.) Of the same kind also are the expressions in Ps. xliv. 22: "For thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter;" and in Isa. xlix. 8: "In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee," the last of which unquestionably had its fulfilment in Christ, while both are referred to by the apostle Paul, as finding their accomplishment in him and the early disciples, (Rom. viii. 36, 2 Cor. vi. 2.) Such passages occurring in the prophetic Scriptures, are obviously of a very general and comprehensive nature, and so far from being limited to any one age or individual, they express sentiments and principles, which are common to all periods of the

church's history. They record facts in experience, which have been a thousand times repeated in actual life, and the persons, in connexion with whom the record was originally given, may be viewed as types, and the record itself a prophecy, of facts appearing in gospel history, only because the truths and principles embodied in them, had there their chief and necessary manifestation. The connexion, however, between such portions of the Old and the New Testament scriptures, and the transactions respectively noticed in each, is not the less real, that it is so general; the adaptation of the one to the other, is not a simple accommodation of Old Testament words, to express similar though quite disconnected events of New Testament history, but is grounded in a proper and necessary correspondence, between the two economies. For whatever at any former period entered as an essential ingredient into the experience of God's faithful people, that could not fail again to make its appearance in the history and the work of Him, whom it behooved to be in all things the exemplar of his people, and in all to have the pre-eminence. There is, therefore, a real and important connexion, in which one kind of transactions stand as types of another, and the words descriptive of the one become predictive of the other, not indeed from any dubiety or complication in their meaning, but because expressive of facts in the earlier, which must have their counterpart in the later dispensation of God.*

The other class of passages, which comes within the terms of the first supposition, is like the one just considered, of a very limited description, and so far corresponds to the former, that it consists of words used originally as historically descriptive of something past, but afterwards regarded as prophetically descriptive of the future events of the gospel. It differs from the other only in this, that the description applies to facts, not of a general and comprehensive, but, on the contrary, of a very special and particular nature. Such, for example, is the passage in Hos. xi. 1: "I have called my Son out of Egypt," unquestionably penned by the prophet in reference to the historical fact of Israel's deliverance from that land

* We might have included in the class specified above, Ps. lxxviii. 2, "I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter dark sayings of old;" which in Matth. xiii. 35, is spoken of as a prediction fulfilled in our Lord's using the parabolic mode of address. For we would explain the connexion between the declaration of the Psalmist, and our Lord's conduct in this respect, on the same principle as that just stated. Every prophet may be said to speak in parables in the sense here conveyed by the original, which is comprehensive of all discourses upon divine things, delivered in measured, elevated, or figurative terms, and possessing such a depth and profundity of meaning, as would prove too much for the discernment of all but the spiritually enlightened. (Lowth, Prælec. IV.) The parables of our Lord formed one species of it, but not by any means the only one. It was the common prophetic, or poetical diction, which admitted of great varieties, as may be understood by simply comparing the 13th chap. of Matthew, with that of Psal. lxxviii. which are both called parabolical, yet extremely different. And as Jesus was pre-eminently a prophet, it became him to use this appropriate diction in some of its most approved forms. So that his doing so might with perfect truth and propriety be cited as the fulfilment of Ps. lxxviii. 2. Not as if that were literally a prediction, and a prediction pointing solely and explicitly to Christ, but as indicating a general fact concerning the prophetical office, which, however it might appear in the history of the Psalmist, or any other Old Testament prophet, required to be found peculiarly and principally in Christ.

of bondage, but applied in the gospel, Matth. ii. 15, to Christ's return from the same country, after a temporary sojourn within its borders. Precisely similar is the use made by John, chap. xix. 36, of the direction in Ex. xii. 46, concerning the paschal lamb, "A bone of him shall not be broken,"—which he not only terms a prophecy of Christ, but intimates that the necessity of its being fulfilled was the secret cause, why the limbs of Jesus were preserved from being broken on the cross. It is obvious, that both the Old Testament scriptures just noticed, are not in the ordinary sense of the term, or considered by themselves, prophecies. They derive their prophetical character from the objects with which they stand in immediate connexion, and which were typical of similar and corresponding objects under the gospel. Israel was nationally the son of God, his first-born because chosen to hold, in comparison of other nations on earth, a pre-eminent place in the love and counsels of Jehovah, and as such well fitted to represent the person of Jesus, who, as Son, holds that place in comparison of all, not only on earth, but also in heaven. Hence the distinctive names of each are sometimes interchanged; Israel is called peculiarly the Son of God, his elect, his servant, the beloved of heaven;* Christ is addressed by the names of Jacob, and Israel, and is characterized as the seed of Abraham.† And as the names and relations, so also the histories of the two must to a certain extent correspond. The great lines of procedure, the leading truths and principles of government, which were wrought out, though amid many defects and imperfections, in the history of the national son, must necessarily find their complete and perfect development in the history of him who is Son by divine and proper relationship; and when the Evangelist informs us of Christ's descent in infancy into Egypt, and his return from it, as taking place that the Scripture, "out of Egypt have I called my Son," might be fulfilled, he is just reading out to us the typical design contemplated by Israel's original sojourn in that country, and their subsequent deliverance. The Scripture fulfilled is prophetical, only because the event which it describes was typical; but in being thus viewed as prophetical, the meaning of its words remains precisely what it was; not one of them is changed from its plain and literal import; nor is the passage merely accommodated to a new and similar, though unconnected event, but strictly and properly fulfilled, because, being descriptive of a typical, that is, a prophetical action, the ultimate design and meaning of the Spirit, as manifested in that portion of the word and dealings of God, could only thus be accomplished.

The same explanation in substance may be given regarding the other example, to which reference has been made. The scripture, "A bone of him shall not be broken," is in itself a historical testimony, and becomes prophetical, simply from being descriptive of a typical or prophetical action. The latter being a real prophecy

* Ex. iv. 22, Isa. xlv. 4, xli. 8, 9, Ps. lx. 5.
† Isa. xlix. 3, Ps. xxiv. 6, Gal. iii. 16.

in action, the other of necessity is a real prophecy in words, though still retaining in this new aspect one and the same meaning, but that merely applied to the prospective event, which was from the first contemplated in the typical institution. Viewed apart from the action as typical, it is simply a piece of history, and could not with propriety be said to describe any thing but the preserving entire of the paschal lamb; but viewed, as it ought to be, in strict and necessary connexion with the action as typical, the prediction enclosed in the one becomes associated with the other, and the gospel counterpart of the type, answers to the terms and completes the meaning of the record given by the Spirit concerning it.

We conclude, then, that in both classes of examples ranged under our first proposition, there is no impropriety in regarding the scriptures quoted as prophecies, demanding a fulfilment in the events of gospel history. Only, the prophecy has its foundation properly in the typical circumstance or action, and from that communicates itself to the words of Scripture. It is the prophetical character of the type, which comes chiefly into view in such cases; and when we read in the Gospels of such and such a thing taking place in the history of Jesus, that the Old Testament scripture descriptive of the type might be fulfilled, the truth we are told is, that the similitude presented beforehand of Christ in the prophetical action, and expressed in that accompanying portion of scripture, did then meet with its designed and proper counterpart. Neither is the Old Testament scripture by itself prophetical, nor does the New Testament scripture invest it with a force and meaning foreign to its original design; the former merely records the typical circumstance or action, which constitutes the prediction, while the latter reads forth its import as such, by announcing the co-relative circumstance or action in which it was fulfilled. And nothing more is needed for perfectly harmonizing to our minds the one scripture with the other, than to regard, as the Spirit evidently intended us to regard, the typical fact and the accompanying testimony as forming together one thing, so that when the gospel speaks of a scripture fulfilled, it is to be understood of that scripture as combined with the prophetical character of what it refers to and delineates.

What is there strange or anomalous in such scripture language, when viewed in the light now presented? It is nothing more than a metonymy of a very common kind, according to which what contains and comprises any thing is put for, or made identical with, the thing itself: as when the earth is named for the inhabitants of the earth, a house for its inmates, a cup for its contents, a word descriptive of events past or to come, as if it actually produced them, (Hos. vi. 5, "I have hewed them by the prophets;" Gen. xxvii. 37, "Behold, I have made him thy lord;" xlviii. 22, "I have given thee one portion above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite," ascribing, as in multitudes of other cases, to the word spoken, or to the person speaking, what he or

it only declared was to come to pass.) Of course, the truth and justice of such a mode of explanation depends entirely upon the reality of the connexion between the alleged type and the antitype —between the earlier event or object described, and the later one to which the description is applied, as with a direct and proper reference to it. We can only expect the explanation to be adopted as satisfactory, if the views unfolded in the preceding chapters are admitted to be sound and well-established. On any other ground, presenting the two objects or events in question as in a state of relative disjunction, at least without any real, internal connexion, such references as those in Matthew to Hosea, and in John to Exodus, cannot but be regarded as mere accommodations. But not so, if, as we contend, the one was ordained in anticipation of the other, and ordained in such a relation of subservience to it, that the earlier would have had no existence, if the later had not been in contemplation beforehand. Seen from this point of view, which we conceive to be the one taken by inspiration, the past appears to run into the future, and to have existed only for it; hence the record or delineation of the past, is naturally and justly, not by a mere fiction of the imagination, considered to possess in its ultimate design the character of a prediction,—embodying a prophetical circumstance or action, it is itself named, by one of the commonest figures of speech, a prophetical word.

II. Our second supposition conceived the possibility of a more proper combination of type with prophecy than this—one, to which the essential truths and principles embodied in some typical transaction were to be taken up and applied in an accompanying prediction, which at once explained the type, and expressly delineated to the eye of faith the coming reality. Here there is both the prophecy in action and the prophecy in words; and to know the specific difference between this, and the preceding supposition, we have just to conceive, that what in the examples already considered was done by New Testament scripture, might be done by Old Testament scripture itself,—that instead of waiting to have the prophetic import of certain types opened out by the inspired pen of evangelists and apostles, God might be pleased to do the same by the hand of contemporary prophets, ordering it so that at the very time the prophetical transactions were in progress of taking place, or of being put on record, the eye of the church should be carried forward to other transactions yet to come, in which the truths and principles embodied in the former should be again brought into operation amid scenes of far greater moment. A variety of reasons might very easily be imagined, which should move God to combine in this manner the word of prophecy with the typical matter of his providential dealings. He might do it for the purpose of giving those, who belonged to the Old Testament church, to see that the things, which happened to them, whether in the way of trial or of blessing, were not the ultimate appointments which God had designed for his church—that however at one period depressed, or at another elevated and enlarged, there were things still to come, of which these formed but the

glimpse and shadow, and on which the expecting eye of his church should be fixed in hope—that, therefore, every thing materially affecting their condition was part, not of a perfect and final, but only of a subordinate and preparatory dispensation, which in the fulness of time should be displaced by another, to which all things were gradually tending. For these and other reasons, we can easily understand, that God might see fit to make the word of prophecy sometimes to accompany the typical transactions of his providence; and if he did, then it is clear that such portions of scripture would so far differ from those already considered, that as in these it was the prophetical character of the type, so now it would be that of the prophecy itself, which should come prominently into view. The typical transactions in this case would form the background, the accompanying prediction the foreground of the picture; the words of the prophet would describe not the past, but the future and grander events of the coming dispensation; and would be connected with the former only as finding in them the occasion, which called forth the prophecy, and the exhibitions of divine truth and principle, which it took and applied to the magnificent realities of the divine kingdom. There would still indeed be but one sense, but there would be a twofold prediction—one more faint and shadowy furnished by the prophetic action, the other more clear and definite furnished by the prophetic word, extracting from the action, so to speak, the ideas it contained of evangelical truth, and foretelling their nobler and brighter manifestations in the events of "the world to come."

The supposition now made is actually verified in another and still larger class of Old Testament scriptures—a class not historical, but strictly and properly prophetical. There was an earlier and inferior chain of circumstances, which in the design and appointment of God were typical of the later and more important things of the gospel—and there was also a prophecy connecting the two together, which, arising out of the former, not only borrowed from that its terms, but from that also drew its forms of truth and principle, which it only raised into fitting adaptation to the corresponding, but higher transactions of the gospel—thus serving at once to indicate the typical design of the past, and to anticipate in appropriate language the coming events of the future.

It may help to render this more clear and intelligible, and may throw some additional light upon the subject, if we refer for illustration to a particular example, which shall be the first, if we mistake not, of this species of prophecy. The example we allude to is the song of Hannah, recorded in the second chapter of 1st Samuel, indited by that pious woman under the inspiration of God, on the occasion of the birth of Samuel. The history leaves no room to doubt, that such was the occasion of its being composed; yet, if viewed in reference to that alone, how comparatively trifling is the theme! How strained and magniloquent the expressions! Hannah speaks of her "mouth being enlarged over her enemies," of the "bows of the mighty men being broken," of the "barren bearing seven," of the "full hiring themselves out for

bread," with other things of a like nature,—all how much exceeding, how completely caricaturing, we may say, the occasion, if the whole that gave rise to it was the fact of a woman hitherto reputed barren becoming the joyful mother of a child! Were the song a mere inflation in the style of eastern poetry, we might not be greatly startled at such grotesque exaggerations, but being a portion of that word, which is all given by inspiration of God, and is as silver tried in the furnace, we cannot for a moment entertain so dishonouring a thought. Indeed, from the whole strain and character of the poem, it is evident, that though occasioned by the birth of Samuel, it was so far from having exclusive reference to that event, that the things concerning it formed one only of a numerous and important class pervading the providence of God, and intimately connected with his highest purposes. In her grief and depression of spirit on account of her childless condition, and the provoking taunts of Peninnah, Hannah had prayed in much fervency to the Lord to look on her affliction and grant the object of her desire; and when the longed-for gift was obtained, as she could not fail to regard it as a gracious answer to her petition, so neither could she overlook the exemplification it afforded of that feature in the divine government which delights to exalt the lowly, while it pours contempt upon the proud and scornful. God, therefore, took occasion by her mouth, and through means of her particular example, to bring fully into view the principle, which had so strikingly developed itself in her experience, but which, like every other principle in the divine government, was to receive its chief and unspeakably its grandest manifestation in the work and kingdom of Christ. Hence, instead of resting in her own experience, and confining her thoughts within the narrow range of her personal history, she wings her flight aloft, and stretches her heaven-directed eye over the wide field of God's providential dealings—tracing, as she proceeds, the operations of that sovereignty, which in the government of the church at large (ver. 8, 9,) ever abases the lofty, and exalts the humble; and since every exercise of this principle is but part of one grand series, which culminates in the dispensation of the gospel, her song runs out, at the close, in a sublime and fervid application of it to the events of Messiah's kingdom, (ver. 10,) who, as the anointed of the Lord, should be raised from his oppressed and humbled condition, and established in his universal dominion, to the everlasting shame and confusion of all his enemies.*

* It is here taken for granted, that the person referred to in the last verse of the song, under the name of "his (i. e. Jehovah's) king," and "his anointed," is Messiah. Indeed the latter expression is just "his Messiah," and would have been better so expressed. It is the first passage in Scripture, where the word occurs as a proper name. That this and the other expression, "his king," should be understood of the kings of Israel, however it may suit the license of some commentators, will be admitted by none, who are disposed to allow to scripture the fair import of its words, and to view the passage in its proper connexion—for the term, "Jehovah's king," could not with any propriety be applied as a general designation to the kings of Israel, but only to the Messiah, and in connexion with his supremacy alone could it be said, that "the adversaries of the Lord would be destroyed, and the ends of the earth judged."

This song of Hannah, then, manifestly consists of two parts, in the one of which only, namely, the closing part, it is properly prophetical. The preceding stanzas are taken up in unfolding, from past and current events, the main idea, the closing ones carry it forward in beautiful and striking application to the affairs of Messiah's kingdom; in the earlier part, it opens out the germ of divine principle unfolded in the type, in the latter it exhibits this rising to its ripened growth and perfection in the final exaltation of the King of Zion. In the first section, the events referred to are past,—the facts of history; in the second, they are future,—the anticipations of prophecy; but both alike, while they possess but one sense, are pervaded also by one and the same great principle, which is first seen floating down the stream of earthly providences, that it might ultimately settle and concentrate itself in the things which concern the Son of man in his kingdom. And as if to remove all shadow of doubt, as to this being the design and purport of Hannah's song, when we open the record of that blessed period, which she saw glistening from afar, we find the Virgin Mary, in her song at the announcement of Messiah's birth, catching up the precise train of thought which so many ages before had been traced by the mother of Samuel, and not only in like strains, but often also in the very same words, giving utterance to it anew. "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden. He hath showed strength with his arm: he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich he hath sent empty away. He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever." Why should the Spirit, heaving in the breast of Mary, have thus borne her thoughts so precisely into the path struck out at a remote age by Hannah? And why should the comparatively trivial events connected with the birth of Samuel have given rise to strains, which both in matter and in style so closely harmonized with those, which were employed to celebrate the incarnation of the King of Glory? For the purpose, doubtless, of teaching how closely even the least important transactions under the old covenant, often bore upon those of the new; and how entirely the spiritual ideas incorporated with the former, were the same with those which waited to receive their highest development in the latter. It is the Spirit's own intimation of his ultimate design in events long since past, and testimonies delivered centuries before,—even to herald the coming of Messiah, and make the church familiar with the form and character of his spiritual dispensation.*

* The view now given of Hannah's song, presents it in a much worthier, as we trust it does also in a truer light, than that given of it by Bishop Jebb, who uses language concerning it, which we can hardly reconcile with any proper belief in its inspiration. The song appears, in his estimation, to have been the mere effusion of

Hannah's song was the first specimen of that combination of prophecy with type, which is now under discussion, and if not all, at least almost all the other examples given of it followed very shortly after, and are chiefly remarkable for standing connected with a new order of types,—those, namely, which arose out of the kingly government, established before the close of Samuel's life. No one, who admits the existence of types at all in Old Testament history, will doubt that much typical matter was furnished by this change in the political constitution of Israel, especially in connexion with the reigns of David and Solomon. And before noticing any particular examples, there are two preliminary questions concerning the subject, on which it will be proper to offer some explanation; Why should the Lord have been so much displeased with the proposal of a change, which was to afford such striking shadows and intimations of Messiah's history and kingdom? Or why, after having reluctantly consented to it, should he have made the things connected with it, the channel of conveying such prophetic glimpses of gospel realities, thereby apparently stamping it with his approval and favour?

As a simple fact in history, there is no difficulty in accounting for God's displeasure regarding the proposed change in the government; for, as he said to Samuel, "they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them."* The constitution under which they had hitherto been placed, was, in the strictest sense, a theocracy,—a government which had no head but God, and which placed every thing essentially connected with their state and well-being under his own immediate presidence and direction. The land in which they dwelt, was *his* land,†—the people themselves were *his* peculiar property and heritage,‡—the laws under which they were placed, were *his* statutes and judgments,§—and the judges appointed to administer them were *his* representatives, and as such were dignified even with his name.‖ It was the peculiar and distinguishing glory of Israel as a nation, that they stood in this near relationship to God, and was that which led Moses to exclaim: "Happy art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee?"¶ But it was a glory of which the people themselves were too carnal-minded for the most part to be duly sensible, and as

Hannah's private, and in great measure unsanctified feelings. "We cannot but feel," he says, "that her exultation partook largely of a spirit far beneath that which enjoins the love of our enemies, and which forbids personal exultation over a fallen foe." He regards it as "unquestionable, that previous sufferings had not thoroughly subdued her temper,—that she could not suppress the workings of a retaliative spirit,—and was thus led to dwell, not on the peaceful glories of his (Samuel's) priestly and prophetic rule, but on his future triumphs over the Philistine armies." (Sacred Literature, p. 397.) If this were really the character of Hannah's song, we may rest assured it would not have been so closely imitated by the inspired Virgin. Both mothers, indeed, were equally inspired to utter forth the purposes, and extol the doings of the Lord; and it is to give a meagre and inadequate view of the song of either of them, to represent it as the mere expression of their personal feelings in regard to their own individual case.

* 1 Sam. viii. 7. † Lev. xxv. 23, Ps. x. 16, Isa. xiv. 25, Jer. ii. 7, &c.
‡ Ex. xix. 5, Ps. xciv. 5, Jer. ii. 7, Joel iii. 2. § Ex. xv. 26; xviii. 16, &c.
‖ Ex. xxii. 28, Ps. lxxxii. 6. ¶ Deut. xxxiii. 29.

they then especially showed, when desiring to be like the Gentiles, they besought that a king should be appointed to reign over them. For what was this but to seek, that in regard to their highest distinction, they might be reduced to a level with other nations,—that God might retire to a greater distance from them, and might no longer be their immediate and glorious King?

But this was far from being the whole of the evil. As every thing belonging to the dispensation, under which they were placed, bore reference to the future and more perfect dispensation of the gospel, the ultimate reason of any important feature or change in their condition can never be understood, without considering the aspect it carried in respect to the better things, in which the whole was to issue. Now what could more exactly typify and represent the essential nature of the gospel dispensation, than the original constitution in this respect of ancient Israel? The gospel dispensation is emphatically "the kingdom of heaven or of God," having for its high end and aim the drawing of men, through Jesus Christ, into near fellowship and communion with God. It is God's reign in the hearts of men, opening up a free and holy intercourse between heaven and earth, and issuing, when consummated, in what John prospectively beheld, when it was proclaimed, "The tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them." Of such a kingdom, the most exact image that could be conceived, was that which appeared in the ancient constitution of Israel's government, wherein God himself sustained the office of king, and had his peculiar residence and appropriate manifestations of glory visibly exhibited in the midst of them. And when the people, in their ignorant and carnal affection for a Gentile custom, sought to have an earthly sovereign for their head, they not only manifested an undervaluation of this their highest privilege, but betrayed also a want of faith and discernment in regard to God's prospective and ultimate design in connexion with their temporary economy. They gave conclusive proof, that "they did not see to the end of that which was to be abolished," and preferred a request, which, if granted according to their expectation, would have defeated in one important particular the object of their singular constitution.

In such circumstances we need not wonder, that God should have expressed his dissatisfaction with the proposal for having a king appointed over them, like the Gentiles. But why then did he accede to it? And why especially did he afterwards make choice of the state of things growing out of it, for shadowing forth in boldest outline the nature and glories of Messiah's kingdom? The divine procedure in this, though apparently capricious, was in reality marked by the highest wisdom, and affords one of the finest examples to be found in Old Testament history, of the mercy and forbearance of God overruling the blind policy of the people for good, and rendering their foolish devices subservient to the furtherance of his gracious purposes.

After God had solemnly protested by Samuel concerning the people's guilt in demanding a king, and had brought them to confess

their error, knowing it was their carnal disposition which had prompted the request, and which required to be met by a suitable arrangement, he so far acceded to the proposed change, as to give directions that a king should be appointed—not, however, as absolute and independent sovereign, but only as the deputy of Jehovah,—having properly no right or supremacy of his own, but ruling simply in the name and in subordination to the will of God.* For this reason his throne was called "the throne of the Lord;"† on which, as the queen of Sheba expressed it to Solomon, he was "set to be king for the Lord his God;"‡ and the kingly government itself was afterwards called "the kingdom of the Lord."§ For the same reason no doubt it was, that Samuel "wrote in a book the manner of the kingdom, and laid it up before the Lord,"‖ that the protest concerning its derived and vicegerent nature might be perpetuated; and as a further declaration of the mind of God concerning it, and the necessity of the regal government being maintained on the only footing he could recognise and own, the government was taken from Saul, on the express ground, that he had departed from the law of the kingdom, and instead of acting as the mere deputy of Heaven, had presumed to walk after the counsel of his own will.

It appears, then, that when the Lord so far yielded to the carnal inclinations of the people, as to consent to the appointment of a king, he accompanied the change with such limitations, as clearly showed it was not his purpose to abolish the theocracy, or to relinquish his place as the supreme Head and Governor of the Jewish commonwealth. At the same time it is equally manifest, that the institution of a kingly government, even in the modified form in which it was conceded, would naturally tend, especially among a people so prone to the outward and visible, to obscure still more the relation which God had condescended to hold toward them; the change removed them, as it were, a step farther from him, and if they could not see to the end of the dispensation in this respect before, they were much less likely to do so after, the establishment of a visible monarchy. And if this monarchy should come in the good providence of God, as it did particularly in the times of David and Solomon, to be invested with a high degree of honour and prosperity, the danger would just be proportionally increased, of the people confining their regard to the representative and visible, and forgetting the invisible and proper king,—of looking for nothing higher, and sighing for nothing better,—of resting satisfied with the present and temporary, to the neglect of the future and ultimate purposes of God.

How, then, did God provide against the evils so manifestly incident to the change in question? By first ordering the events connected with it in such a manner as to render them most exactly typical of Messiah's history and kingdom; and then, lest the typical aspect of things should be lost sight of in consequence of their

* See Warburton's Divine Legation, B. V., sect. 3.
† 1 Chron. xxix. 23.
‡ 2 Chron. ix. 8.
§ 2 Chron. xiii. 8.
‖ 1 Sam. x. 2.

present interest or importance, by coupling with them the word of prophecy, which at once explained their typical import and held out the prospect of other events immensely more interesting and important still. By this arrangement, what would otherwise have tended to obscure the purpose of God, and thwart the main design of his preparatory dispensation, became in a wonderful manner subservient to the end in view. Even though another head was interposed between him and the Jewish people, every thing was so admirably contrived regarding it, as instead of over-shadowing, to render more distinctly perceptible the form and pattern of his heavenly kingdom. Thus all the stirring incidents and singular occurrences, the dangers and troubles first, the unrivalled glory and splendour afterwards appearing in the reigns of David and Solomon, which of themselves might have utterly engrossed the national mind and shut out all expectation of any greater things to come, became in the hands of God's Spirit only the ground and occasion of opening out the corresponding features of Messiah's coming history; and so far from the institution of the kingly government serving to throw a vail over the prospective work and appearance of God, when he should dwell in very deed with men on earth, an opportunity was thereby afforded of disclosing the things, which concern the latter, with an air of individuality and distinctness, with a variety of detail and vividness of colouring, not found in any portion of ancient Scripture. In short, the new series of transactions in the earthly kingdom were constructed so as to evolve the same lines of procedure, the same divine truths and principles as were afterwards to be developed in the establishment of the heavenly kingdom under Christ, that is, the one was ordained to be typical of the other; and rising, as it were, from this lower platform, and prompted by the circumstances connected with it, the spirit of prophecy directed the eye of faith onward to the better things to come, under aspects precisely similar in form, though in terms suited to much grander and higher realities.

As an example of this combination of prophecy with the types growing out of the affairs of the temporal kingdom, we may take what was probably the first in point of time,—the second Psalm. There we have presented to our view a royal inauguration, under the following circumstances: The heathen nations, with their rulers, oppose it, (v. 1, 2;) they agree among themselves, if the appointment should be made, practically to disregard and disown it, (v. 3;) the Almighty nevertheless perseveres in his purpose, scorning the combined opposition of such impotent adversaries, (v. 4;) instead of overturning the newly-established kingdom, they only procure trouble and vexation to themselves, (v. 5;) the anointed king is enthroned on Zion,—as Jehovah's son, is made heir of all things, —is authorized to extend his sway over the most distant regions of the earth, quelling with resistless energy every hostile movement, (v. 6—9;) and in consideration of what has thus been decreed and ratified in heaven, the psalm concludes with a word of counsel addressed to the great and powerful on earth, to be wise for their own interests, and submit themselves in time to the government of

this divinely constituted king. That in all this we can trace the lines of Messiah's history, is too obvious to be disputed; and the older Jewish doctors themselves, as we learn by a quotation in Venema from Solomon Jarchi, agreed that "it should be expounded of king Messiah; but in accordance," he adds, "with the literal sense, and that it may be used against the heretics, (i. e. the Christians) it is proper that it be explained as relating to David himself." And it is not a little strange that this opinion, in its first origin no better than a Rabbinical artifice to withdraw an argument from the cause of Christianity, should have been adopted by the great majority even of Christian divines, who generally agree in understanding the psalm as in the literal sense applicable only to David. But if by literal sense is to be understood the plain and natural import of the words employed, what foundation can there be for such an opinion? David was not opposed in his claims on the throne of Israel by any heathen rulers, but rather protected and encouraged, in so far as he came into contact with them; nor was he anointed king on the holy hill of Zion, but long before that Mount was consecrated, or even came into his possession; nor, after being settled there, had he any contest for his royal dignity with heathen adversaries; and for what is said about extending the sovereignty granted to the most distant lands, compelling universal subjection to it, and warning all kings and judges of the earth to submit themselves on pain of the most fearful consequences, there is so little ground for it in the case of David, that nothing scarcely can be more extravagant, than the attempt to refer such expressions in their literal sense to him.*

* This is now generally acknowledged even in Germany, as may be seen by consulting Rosenmuller's notes on the psalm, and Hengstenberg. Along with others of the most judicious and learned of their countrymen, these distinguished commentators not only admit, but show at large, that the psalm "cannot well be understood as applying either to David, or to Solomon, much less to any of the later Hebrew kings; that it is most safe to follow the judgment of the more ancient Hebrews, and to consider the psalm as celebrating that mighty king, called by way of eminence *the Messiah—the anointed*, to whose coming at a future period the Hebrews looked forward, by whom they hoped the monarchy would be restored, rendered much more extensive and illustrious than it had been before, and to whose power would be subjected all the nations and all the kings of the earth." This judgment, however, is, on the part of Rosenmuller, strangely qualified by two statements, which are not only groundless in themselves, but directly at variance also with his interpretation of the main scope. For while he justly concludes, that the psalm could not be properly understood of David, (or indeed of any Hebrew king,) because the circumstances of his life were not in accordance with its terms, he infers on the same ground, that it could not be composed by David; which is as much as to say, that it could not be composed by any one. For if the discordance with David's circumstances with the literal import of the psalm disqualified him from being its author, of course all others must have been disqualified too, as the same discordance is allowed to have existed equally in their case. And when he says, that "no one, who reflects without prejudice or pre-conceived opinion, upon what is said in v. 9, respecting the cruel treatment by the king of those whom he had conquered, will believe that Jesus was present, as it were, to the mind of the poet when the psalm was composed," what is it in effect but to give up the prophetical character of the psalm altogether? He is no prophet, who succeeds in one part of a prediction, and fails in another. Indeed, the assertion proceeds on the supposition, contradicted by 2 Pet. i. 21, and by the whole nature of inspiration, that an inspired writer must always have known the precise nature of the events he was commissioned to predict. It is further chargeable with the error of denying language to be strictly applicable to Christ, which Christ repeatedly applies to himself, Rev. ii. 27, xii. 5, xix. 15.

But has the psalm, then, no connexion with the life and kingdom of David? Unquestionably it has, though not as finding there the events and circumstances, which it either historically, or prophetically delineated. What connexion then? Such simply as arose from the fundamental truths and principles, applied in the psalm to Messiah's history and reign, being furnished by those of the king of Israel. Although the words of the prophecy can by no means be confined to David, yet how closely in all its essential features did his case correspond to Christ's? In both alike we see an absolute irreversible appointment on the part of God to the office of king over his elect people—an opposition of the most violent and headstrong nature struggling to prevent this appointment being carried into effect—the fruitlessness of the efforts made by the adverse parties to attain the object of their ambition, and the gradual submission or final discomfiture (still partly future in the case of Messiah) of all, who sought within the allotted region of sovereignty to disannul the purpose of Heaven. The parallel is most striking and minute; the correspondence between the type and the antitype is every thing that could be desired; but the prophecy, which connects the two together, while it naturally sprung from the typical events of David's history, and derived from these the several forms of truth and principle it embodied, was predictive only of the things, which concern Him, who was at once David's Son and David's Lord.

After this lengthened exposition, it will be needless, I trust, to follow the subject farther into detail. It is easy to apply the same principle of interpretation to the other psalms, which belong to the class now under consideration,—in particular to the 16th, the 22d, the 69th, the 110th, and the 118th. These, at least, and perhaps some others, might be shown to be precisely similar, in the combination of type with prophecy, to the 2d,—the psalms themselves being prophecies, in the strictest sense, of Messiah and his kingdom, but occasioned and modelled by certain typical transactions occurring in the history of the earthly king and kingdom, so that to a certain extent they may be accommodated to the latter, though the former alone reach to the weight and magnitude of the expressions employed, as they alone were properly delineated.*

* It is scarcely necessary to add, that the view given above of that portion of the Messianic psalms, which is comprehended in the specified class, differs materially from that adopted by Pareau (Interp. of Old T. Bib. Cabinet. Vol. XXV.) and some others, according to which the Psalmist merely found an occasion or pretext, as it were, in his own circumstances, for dilating on the somewhat similar, though much greater and more important affairs of Messiah. For the one was much more than the occasion of the other—it was also the shadow and figure; there was a prediction couched in the events of David's life, as well as in the words he uttered; and it was just because the former were ordained to be typical of the latter, that they could furnish, as they did, the form and representation of the Messianic prophecy. This also accounts for the peculiar character of the prophecies of that period, as being not only for the most part of a regal cast, but that combined with suffering, trial, opposition, and victory. They were thrown, so to speak, into the mould of David's history; and that not from any private impulse of the Psalmist himself, as Pareau would lead us to suppose, but for great reasons, as we have seen, connected with the change of government, and reaching to the whole body of the people.

III. There is still another of our three suppositions remaining to be considered, according to which it was conceived, that there might be a typical transaction, not past as in the last case, but still future, or a line perhaps of typical transactions, stretching considerably onwards; and along with this, it was conceived, there might, for important reasons, be coupled a word of prophecy, not describing so much, as pre-supposing what was typical, and carrying forward the truths and principles embodied in it to the far higher concerns of God's everlasting kingdom. The difference between this, and the last supposition, is so immaterial, as to the principle on which it proceeds, that no lengthened illustration can be required. The essential nature of the case is evidently not changed by the typical transactions being themselves prospective, instead of past or present; as no one acquainted with the nature of prophecy can be ignorant, that though generally prompted and occasioned by something in the present circumstances of those, to whom its revelations were first announced, it sometimes also contemplated future circumstances as the ground and occasion of its exercise, and proceeded to unfold the predictions more immediately suited to these, as if they were actually present. The prophet was not necessarily the messenger of God to his own age. Commissioned as he was to deal with future events and future times, a message occasionally was given to him, which respected less the condition of those, among whom he lived, than others, who should occupy a certain advanced stage of the church's history. And when he was moved by the Spirit of God to deliver such a prospective message, as he would naturally throw himself into the situation of the persons whom he addressed, so if there was any thing typical in the events then unfolding, it would naturally have the same connexion with the accompanying predictions, as in the case last considered; that is, the one would supply the form and principle, which the other expanded and applied to the coming realities of the gospel.

The only addition, which this view of the prophecies in question, makes to what is generally held concerning them, is that the prophet, while he realized as present, and spake as from the midst of circumstances, which were not present but future, recognised also something in these of a typical nature, and moulded his predictions accordingly. If the former is allowed to have been done, nothing can be conceived to render it improbable, that the other should not also be done, but, on the contrary, there is the strongest argument from analogy that it should be so. We are aware, indeed, that even the former has been denied by several learned men on the Continent, who, in their reckless pursuit of theory against both fact and reason, have sought to disprove the supposition, that the prophets ever anticipated future circumstances, and from these as present went on to predict a still more distant future. The error is refuted at large by Hengstenberg, in his admirable work, The Christology of the Old Testament, who justly remarks concerning the nature of the prophetic impulse: "The prophets, to whom all communications were made in vision, were in an ecstasy,

—they lived in the events which they announced, and the events lived in them. They either took their station in the present, and thence beheld the less distant future; or they took their station in the nearer future, and thence extended their view to the more remote. In the latter case, the nearer future is represented by them as present, and from it they viewed that as past, which in reality was still future; it lies before them with such intuitive clearness, that they live and act in it."*

There are, however, a few predictions, which may be ranged under the present division, and which can hardly be said to stand in this entire isolation, from the immediate circumstances of the prophet. The very next prediction in reference to gospel times, which appears after the song of Hannah, connects itself equally with the present and the future, and both in the circumstances which occasioned it, and the aspect under which it presents the heavenly kingdom, contemplates alike the things which belonged to the generation then existing, and to that which was immediately to come. The prediction we refer to, is the one addressed by Nathan to David, and recorded in 2 Sam. vii. The immediate occasion of this prophecy was the purpose of David to build a house to the Lord. It did not accord with the mind of God to allow David to execute this purpose; and though no reason is given there for that honour being withheld from him, yet elsewhere, (1 Chron. xxii. 8—10,) this is stated to have been done, because he was a man of war, while it was fitting that the temple should be built by a man of peace, and the work was therefore reserved for Solomon. Such is the historical, and consequently the expressed reason, but how easily may we discover under it a deeper ground,—that, namely, which arose from the typical relations existing between these events in the temporal kingdom, and the corresponding events of the new dispensation? It required the lives of both David and Solomon to foreshadow, in its completeness, the one life of Christ in his kingdom,—the events of the first having respect chiefly to his entrance on the kingdom, amid many difficulties, trials, sufferings, and victories; the events of the second having respect to the final settlement, peace, and glory of the kingdom, when the restitution of all things shall have come, and Messiah shall no longer reign in the midst of his enemies, but with these for ever put beneath his feet. The temple, which was the crowning-point and glory of the earthly kingdom in its state of perfection, must therefore be reserved for Solomon, and could not, without violating the truth and order of these typical relations, have been executed by David —seeing he had only to represent successively a suffering, a prevailing, and triumphant Messiah, while it was given Solomon to

* Christology, p. 400 of the American Translation by Dr. Keith. In proof of this general view he appeals to Hos. xiii. and xiv.; Micah iv. 8, 9, vii. 7, 11; besides, the whole of the latter part of Isaiah, in which he conceives the prophet to have contemplated the captivity in Babylon, as a thing already existing—to have thought, felt, and spoken, as if that had become present to him; and so did not, as with his other predictions, make known to his contemporaries the separate discourses, of which this part is composed, but left the whole as a legacy to posterity.

shadow forth a Messiah in his full inheritance of blessing and glory.

But while the honour of building a temple to Jehovah was for such reasons denied to David, he received, in place of it, the high satisfaction of having the kingdom confirmed for ever in the possession of his family. The word of promise brought to him was, that the Lord would set his son upon the throne of Israel—would be a Father to him, and acknowledge him for a son—would never supplant him by one of another line, though he might vest him with the rod of chastisement in the case of obstinate transgression—and would thus give an absolute perpetuity to the house and the throne of David. That this prophecy included, and bore a pre-eminent respect to the Messiah, is clear, from the special ascription to him in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of the clause: "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a son;" and indeed, it could scarcely be overlooked, either by David himself, or by any enlightened Israelite. For while it made promise of a succession of lineal descendants upon the throne, whom David would naturally regard as his offspring, in the ordinary sense of the term, it spake further of a fixed and absolute perpetuity to his house and kingdom, which clearly pointed to the enthronement of Him, of whose dominion there should be no end. We conceive, therefore, that in this prophecy "respect was had, not to Solomon alone, but to all the successors of David; that the threatening it contained of a gentle chastisement, in the case of transgression, could only, from the very nature of the thing, have a reference to those of them who should merit chastisement; and that the promise of God being a Father and they sons, while it pertained to them all without distinction, as those who held the place of God in the theocratic government, at the same time pertained in all its strength, and in quite a singular manner, to that most illustrious of all the successors of David, to whom he himself even principally referred, the promise regarding the perpetuity of the royal dignity, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1—7."*

This prediction, if viewed thus in what seems to be its plainest interpretation, can scarcely be said to come within the limits of our third supposition; for while it certainly points to something in the earthly kingdom, which was typical of something in the heavenly,—the constant succession in the one so long as it lasted, undoubtedly foreshadowing the endless perpetuity of dominion in the other,—both are alike the matter of express prediction. The one is not pre-supposed by the prophet as a thing already existing, and from which he takes his standing-point to view and describe the corresponding reality in the other; but the whole is viewed as one interminable line stretching onward from the present occupant of the throne of Israel, to the investiture of Him, who was to "sit upon the throne of David for ever, and of whose dominion there should be no end." If the view, however, given by Kennicott, in his Remarks on select passages of the Old Testament, and adopted by

* Pareau on Interp. of Old Test.—see Biblical Cabinet, vol. XXV. p. 232.

Horsley in his Notes, according to which Christ alone is spoken of throughout the prophecy as the one by whom the house was to be built, the chastisement of iniquity borne, (as their rendering makes it,) and the perpetual dominion established,—if this view were admitted, and it certainly is quite admissible, then the prophecy would come entirely within the terms of our present proposition. For in that case the succession of a line of sons in the temporal kingdom, occasionally chastened for iniquity, yet honoured to erect a glorious temple to Jehovah, and to occupy without interruption the throne of the kingdom, would just have been viewed as the faint type and pattern of what was now foretold in express language concerning the heavenly kingdom,—the succession, the chastisement, the erection of the house, and the perpetual dominion being all and exclusively Christ's, as mentioned in the prophecy, and at the same time suggested by the line of typical events, which were in the prophet's eye, though they did not form a part of his prediction.

But even if we prefer the other, which certainly is the simpler and more common view of this prophecy, it is still very closely related to the class of predictions under which we have ranged it; for it forms a sort of connecting link between this and the preceding class. It formed the common ground, more especially in connexion with Solomon, the first and chief son in the promised line of succession, out of which arose various predictions occasioned and moulded by prospective typical events, which though future, were still very closely associated with the present. Such, for example, were the 45th and 72d Psalms, on the supposition, which is generally allowed, that they were penned by David. Though written by his hand, however, they were evidently composed more immediately for that state of things, which began at the close of his own life-time, when not only a successor was granted to him on the throne of Israel, but such a flood of glory at the same time was poured around the earthly kingdom, as must have tempted both king and people to think only of the present. Therefore, to carry them above this temptation, and direct their eye onward to the still greater than Solomon, who was to come, David, by the Spirit of God, left the delineation of a king and kingdom, in comparison with which every thing that then existed appeared little and shadowy. It was of Messiah—of Messiah alone, and not in any respect of Solomon, as Michaelis and Rosenmuller, with more cautious interpreters, are obliged to confess, that the Psalmist sung, when in Psalm xlv. he celebrated a king, adorned with the perfection of spiritual beauty, (v. 2,) possessed of resistless power, to be wielded for victory in the cause of righteousness and truth, (v. 3—5,) the fellow of God, occupying an everlasting throne, exercising a most pure and blessed government, (v. 6—8,) married to a spouse of surpassing beauty, and filling the whole earth with a noble progeny of princes;—as also, when in Psalm lxxii. 4, he described the king's son as occupying an eternal throne, (ver. 5,) establishing a peace that should be as lasting as the earth, (ver. 7,) extending his dominion so as to embrace every region of the habitable globe,

(ver. 8,) and at once bringing all on earth beneath the yoke of his authority, and giving them to partake of the abundance of his blessing, (ver. 17, &c.) Such things, indeed, could be predicted with any truth of none but Messiah, yet how exactly were all the lines furnished by the personal history of Solomon? In him we behold a son of David and a king of Israel, surpassing all others in the graces of his person, and the splendour of his royal state, —pre-eminent for his knowledge of divine truth, and the rich flow of wisdom, which was ever proceeding from his lips,—most secure and stable in his government,—in his dominion most extensive, in his administration most prosperous and peaceful, the object of universal admiration and delight;—in all as near an exemplar, as might be found on earth, of Him, who was celebrated in those prophetic songs. And could any thing be conceived more wisely adapted to keep alive, or we might even say, to quicken and elevate the faith of the people under circumstances naturally fitted to weaken and destroy it, and lead them, while captivated with the attractive qualities of Solomon, and the splendid glories of his reign, to think of better and higher things yet to come, than the portraiture drawn beforehand in these psalms of David, of the final kingdom of God and Him, who was to reign over it,—a portraiture which contained, indeed, every bright and engaging feature, which appeared in the state of things then unfolding in the earthly Israel, but that raised and expanded so as to present to the eye of faith another state of things, unspeakably higher and better still, —a kingdom truly heavenly in its nature, of universal extent and endless duration, and presided over by a King all glorious and divine?

The prophetic psalms now in question, then, were, as to their proper nature, simple and direct predictions of Messiah and his kingdom,—occasioned and moulded by the typical transactions and circumstances, which were to arise in the approaching future. But the most important examples to be found in Scripture of this class of predictions, occur in that portion of Isaiah's prophecies, which reaches from the 40th chapter to the end of the book. The grand object in the prophet's eye, during the whole of this magnificent chain of prophecy, is the Lord Jesus Christ, in the manifold variety of his work and history,—his sufferings and victories, the completeness of his redemption, the recovery and blessedness of his people, the perpetual overthrow of his enemies, and the final glory of his kingdom. The manner in which this connected series of predictions is entered on, might alone satisfy us, that nothing less than this is the great burden of the prophecy; for the voice there mentioned of one crying in the wilderness, is reported by all the Evangelists to have been lifted up by John the Baptist, in the strictest sense, as intended to describe his office and mission to the church of God. And if John stands in the threshold, who should possess the interior but He, whose approach and kingdom John was sent merely to herald and proclaim? With this also entirely correspond the first intimations of that message, which the prophet was com-

missioned to declare. Of what did the Spirit, witnessing in his bosom, impel him to speak? Of comfort and deliverance to an oppressed church. And by what means to be effected? By such a "revelation of the glory of the Lord as all flesh would see;" or, as it is again expressed, by such a manifestation of the divine presence and goodness, as would cause it to be said to the cities of Judah, "Behold your God." What with any propriety can be said to fulfil the terms of such announcements, but the mighty fact published in the gospel, of "God manifest in the flesh," or "the glory of the Lord revealed in the face of Jesus Christ?"

But is there, then, no reference made by Isaiah in this portion of his writings, to the return from Babylon, and the re-establishment of God's afflicted remnant in the land of their fathers? Unquestionably there is—but not so much in the way of direct prediction, as in that of being foreseen and presupposed by the prophet. In the vision presented to his mind, the events connected with that earlier redemption were already past, or in the course of being accomplished, and are contemplated as the earnest and exemplar of the much better things in prospect, on which he mainly seeks to fix the hope and expectation of the church. In one portion of the series, reaching from chap. xliv. 24, to xlviii. 22, where his chief object is to awaken confidence in the sure fulfilment of the things predicted, which might well have seemed incredibly wonderful to a broken and enfeebled church, he specially mentions and appeals to the history of the Babylonish deliverance—the facts of which, viewed not as prophetically, but as historically true, furnished undoubted proof, that no natural unlikelihood in the greater and more distant events now unfolded, and no apparent difficulties standing in the way of their execution, could be sufficient to prevent their accomplishment. He, who could speak with confidence of the overthrow of Babylon by the king of Persia, while she was still in the summit of her power and glory—who, at the very moment she was the scourge and terror of the nations, could see and describe her as a spoiled and forlorn captive—and could show the weeping exiles of Judea, not only as rescued from her grasp, but sent back in honour by the new sovereign of the east, to revive the glories of Jerusalem, while her proud destroyer was left to sink and moulder into irrecoverable ruin—he, who could foresee all this as already present, and commit to his church the record of such events generations before they took place, might well claim from his people their implicit confidence, when announcing the still greater and more distant events of an everlasting salvation, which should at once extend its blessings to the remotest lands, and raise the descendants of Jacob to pre-eminent honour and blessing, (chap. xlv. 17, 22, xlix. 18—26.) The views of the church were thus carried above and beyond the return from Babylon to Judea, and she was enabled more distinctly to conceive and more confidently to expect, the unspeakably higher deliverance still remaining to be accomplished.

That portion of Isaiah, which has been particularly noticed,

seems to be the only one in this part of his predictions, in which direct reference is made to the Babylonish deliverance; and it is made, as we have seen, not for the purpose of confining and settling the eye of the church upon that nearer event, but rather for the purpose of raising her thoughts and strengthening her confidence in regard to the final deliverance, which was designed to be the great object of her hope. The first is contemplated as past in reference to the second, as the "old things" that had, in a manner, already received their fulfilment, in comparison of the other more distant and greater things, which even to the prophet's eye were still in prospect, (chap. xlii. 9, xlviii. 3.;) its fitting pledge and forerunner, not only as preceding it in point of time, but also as unfolding similar interpositions on the part of God, and producing similar results on behalf of his people. And after having made the direct reference mentioned, to the events of the first deliverance—having stopped, as it were, for a time in his course, to give a brief description of these earlier events, with the view of removing, by an appeal to them, every ground of doubt or uncertainty regarding the nobler things to come, the prophet thenceforth proceeds more at ease with his lofty theme, expatiating with a noble freedom on the manifold acts and purposes of God, which were to appear in the history of Christ's work and kingdom. These alone are what he portrays; nothing short of these can answer to the magnificent terms he employs in his glowing delineation of things to come; but the delineation itself, especially toward the beginning, not unfrequently takes its hue and character from the things, which happened in connexion with the return from Babylon. For the one was not only preparative to the other, but typical of it—manifesting in its more important and leading features, the same views, principles and operations, which were to be exhibited in connexion with the establishment of his everlasting kingdom. The low, prostrate, and captive condition of the church before the Lord set to his hand for her deliverance—the mighty power of her enemies, and their heaven-derived right to hold her in subjection—the utter impotence of all idol or creature power to remove the barriers, that stood in the way of her rescue—the merciful interposition of Jehovah's arm, and the peculiar revelation of his power and glory in her behalf—the equally marvellous and unexpected nature of his working, threshing, as it were, the mountains, and causing obstacles, apparently insurmountable, quickly to disappear—the blessed security of his people, even though tossed amid many tempests and still gnashed on by their baffled foes—the prosecution of the divine purposes in their favour, till all had reached the settled order and completeness contemplated on the part of Heaven: —all these lines of procedure distinguish the history of the church and God's dealings toward her, at both the epochs in question, though with a brightness and majesty in the one case far surpassing that of the other. And the prophet, standing in idea amid the one class of events, which he considered as already matters of history, contemplates and describes the other, which alone he pro-

perly predicts, under aspects and figures suggested by what was proceeding around him. In short, his prophetic descriptions of the work and kingdom of Messiah bear upon them *the type* of that portion of Jewish history, amid the prospective scenes of which they were uttered; but it is not the less one meaning, which his words convey, and one class of events, which they foretell.*

We here conclude the first part of our remarks on the connexion between type and prophecy. If we have succeeded in the object we had in view, we have shown, that they appear connected together in three different ways—in one of which the prophetic sense lies first in the type, and in the words only as descriptive of the type, while in the other two there is, not a double sense, but a double prophecy—a prediction in type, more general and indefinite because only embodying the great truths and principles, which were to be developed in the antitype, accompanied by a prediction in words, disclosing in express terms what was afterwards to be accomplished, and these terms suggested by the corresponding typical events, with which the prophecy was connected. In this view of the matter there is no confusion, disorder, or ambiguity; each part holds its appropriate place; only the twofold object designed by God in the use of types and prophecies, and often pursued apart, was carried on at once, that is, while the eye of the church was directed by prophecy to the coming realities of the gospel, the minds of her people were at the same time familiarized, by typical providences, to the great truths and principles, which these were to unfold and manifest.

II. We proceed now to offer a few remarks on the views respectively held by those, who have taken part on either side of the controversy, which has been maintained upon the subject. Overlooking, as we conceive, the proper connexion existing in the cases referred to between type and prophecy, and misled by the apparent reference in the predictions both to Jewish and to Christian objects, the opinion contended for, on the one side, has been, that such predictions contain a double sense, the one primary and the other secondary, or the one literal and the other mystical; while the opponents of this view utterly reject more than one meaning and one reference, and when the prediction is applied otherwise than their hypothesis would warrant in New Testament scripture, they regard it simply as an accommodation of the words beside the original and proper import. A lengthened investigation of these views would be quite foreign to our purpose, but justice to the principles which we have attempted to develope requires something to be said on each.

1. And first, in regard to the double sense—when we have it laid down to us, as a proper and settled canon of interpretation for the prophetic parts of ancient Scripture, that the "same prophe-

* For other examples of this and the preceding class, see Appendix, which treats of the Restoration of the Jews. The prophecies bearing on that subject, uttered before the return from Babylon, chiefly belong to the third, and those uttered after, to the second class.

cies frequently refer to different events, the one near and the other remote—the one temporal, the other spiritual and perhaps eternal; that the expressions are partly applicable to one and partly to another, and that what has not been fulfilled in the first we must apply to the second;" it is impossible to avoid the conviction, that there must in that case be a most painful degree of uncertainty and confusion resting on such portions of Scripture. The difficulty of threading one's way, without the direction of an unerring guide, through such involved and complicated meanings, must often be insuperable. And even if that difficulty could be mastered, the objection would still remain, that, for any thing we can see, such an intricacy in the very structure of prophecy must have tended so to obscure and embarrass the subject, as to render the word of prophecy of comparatively little value, whether as the foundation of hope to the Old Testament church, or the evidence of faith to the New.

As affording an argument in support of the truth of Christianity, or furnishing evidence to the faith of the New Testament church, great ingenuity, indeed, has been employed by Warburton and others, to establish the grounds of this double sense. The line of argumentation, however, adopted by Warburton, lies open to two special objections, which have been ably pressed against it by Bishop Marsh, and which may be held to demonstrate its unsoundness as employed by him. 1. It first of all proceeds upon the supposition, that the double sense of prophecy is precisely analogous to the double sense of allegory; "whereas," to use the words of Marsh, "the two things, instead of being analogous, are totally dissimilar. When we interpret a prophecy, to which a double meaning is ascribed, the one relating to the Jewish, the other to the Christian dispensation, we are in either case concerned with an interpretation of *words*. For the same words, which, according to one interpretation, are applied to one event, are, according to another interpretation, applied to another event. But in the interpretation of an allegory, we are concerned only in the *first* instance with an interpretation of words; the *second* sense, which is usually called the allegorical sense, being an interpretation of *things*. The interpretation of the words gives nothing more than the plain and simple narratives themselves, (the allegory generally assuming the form of a narrative;) whereas the *moral* of the allegory is learnt by an application of the things signified by those words, to other things, which resemble them, and which the former were intended to suggest. There is a fundamental difference, therefore, between the interpretation of an allegory, and the interpretation of a prophecy, with a double sense."* 2. The view of Warburton is, besides, liable to the objection, that it not only implies the prophecies themselves, which have the double sense, to have been very dark and obscure, but also unnecessarily precludes the existence of any other prophecies, more plain, direct, and explicit—until at least the dispensation, under which the former were given, and for

* Marsh's Lectures, p. 444.

which their very obscurity adapted them, had well-nigh reached its close. He contends, that the veiled meaning of the prophecies was necessary, in order at once to awaken some general expectations among the Jews of better things to come, and at the same time to prevent these from being so definitely understood, as to weaken their regard to the existing state of things. It is fatal to this view of the matter, that in point of fact many of the most literal and direct prophecies concerning the Messiah, were contemporaneously delivered with those, which are alleged to possess the secondary sense, and to carry only an obscure and veiled reference to the Messiah. If God's method of dealing toward the Jews could only admit of the latter, then it must inevitably have been defeated by the former. And it must besides have been, not so much a ground of blame, as a matter of necessity, an essential part of God's design concerning them, that they could "not steadfastly look to the end of that which was to be abolished." In both respects this is precisely the reverse of the real state of things; for the more clearly they perceived the meaning of the prophecies, and the end of their symbolical institutions, the more did they enter into the design of God, and attain to the spiritual condition which it was proper for them to occupy.

It must be admitted, however, that these objections apply chiefly to that vindication of the double sense, which has been adopted by Warburton, in connexion with his peculiar theory. The argument in support of it, is capable of being freed in a great measure from both objections, and is perhaps put by Davidson in its most plausible form. "What is the double sense? Not the convenient latitude of two unconnected senses, wide of each other, and giving room to a fallacious ambiguity, but the combination of two related, analogous, and harmonizing, though disparate subjects, each clear and definite in itself; implying a twofold truth in the prescience, and creating an aggravated difficulty, and thereby an accumulated proof, in the completion. For a case in point: to justify the predictions concerning the kingdom of David in their double force, it must be shown of them, that they hold in each of their relations, and in each were fulfilled. So that the double sense of prophecy, in its true idea, is a check upon the pretences of a vague and unappropriated prediction, rather than a door to admit them. But this is not all. For if the prediction distribute its sense into two remote branches or systems of the divine economy; if it show not only what is to take place in distant times, but describe also different modes of God's appointment, though holding a certain and intelligible resemblance to each other; such prediction becomes not only more convincing in the argument, but more instructive in the doctrine, because it expresses the correspondence of God's dispensations in their points of agreement, as well as his foreknowledge."*

This view so far coincides with the one we have endeavoured to establish, that it plainly recognises a combination of type with pro-

* Davidson on Prophecy, p. 196.

phecy; but differs, in that it supposes both to have been included in the prediction, the one constituting the primary, the other the secondary sense of its terms. And undoubtedly, even as thus stated, it might be said to evince the correspondence of divine doctrine, unfolded in the earlier and later dispensations, precisely as is done, when the first exhibition of doctrine is regarded, according to our view, simply as a historical type, not predicted, and the second alone is held to be the object of the prophecy. But when it is further contended, that prophecy, with such a double meaning, instead of rendering the evidence it furnishes of divine foresight, more vague and unsatisfactory, only supplies an accumulated proof of it, by creating an aggravated difficulty in the fulfilment, it seems to be forgotten, that the terms of the prediction to admit of such a twofold fulfilment by means of events so widely different, though similar and related, must of necessity have been made so much more general and indefinite. Now the conviction produced in the mind, of the reality of divine foresight and interposition, by comparing a prediction with its alleged fulfilment, must always be according to the precision of its terms, and the number of particular points, in which it requires to be met by special corresponding facts in providence. And if there were prophecies so constructed as to be comprehensive of two distinct series of events, actually holding in each of the relations, and in each fulfilled, the inevitable conclusion is, that the language employed must have been of so loose and general a kind, as to furnish no precise and determinate criteria for the mind to rest upon; there would be some ground, at least, for entertaining the suspicion, that neither was any prophetic gift required for uttering the prediction, nor any special providence manifested in its fulfilment.*

But our chief objection to the double sense of prophecy is in regard to the fact, on which the theory is founded,—that there are

* Let it not be supposed, however, that we doubt the existence of some prophecies of this description. There are prophecies, the chief object of which, like that of types, was to show the correspondence of God's dispensations, or the uniformity of truth and principle manifested in his dealings toward his church in all ages, rather than to afford any conclusive evidence of the veracity of his word. Such prophecies were of necessity general and comprehensive, admitting of manifold fulfilments; and it is in regard to them, that we would understand the singularly pregnant and beautiful remark of Bacon, in the second book of his Advancement of Learning, that "divine prophecies, being of the nature of their Author, with whom a thousand years are but as one day, are therefore not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishment; though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age." The first prophecy given to fallen man, may serve as a good illustration of this. For as the future plant lies inwrapped in the seed corn, and is only made to grow and expand into its full dimensions, by the germinating processes of nature, so in the prediction, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent," the whole work and history of redemption are enclosed; future prophecies only served to open out and display its manifold richness and variety of parts; and the history of God's church and people in every succeeding age was constantly affording new and progressive developments of its blessed import,—though it can only be said to have its "height and fulness" in the completion of Christ's personal work on earth, and the final glorification of his church and kingdom. This line of remark might be extended to many other prophecies: such, for example, as the blessing pronounced on the seed of Abraham, and the prophetic threatenings uttered against the enemies of God's cause and people.

prophecies really predictive of two similar, though disparate series of events, strictly applicable to each, and finding their fulfilment in each. This necessarily forms the main position of the advocates of the double sense, and when brought to particulars, they invariably fail to establish it; the terms of each single prediction always require to be more or less tortured, in order to admit of one of the senses put upon it; and the flagrant disregard of the plain and unequivocal meaning of the words of Scripture, with which this has often been done, is one of the most striking proofs of the blinding influence which the love of system may exert over the most powerful minds. We had occasion to notice, for example, that the absolute impossibility of understanding the 2d and 45th Psalms of any other person than Messiah, has driven some of the ablest German commentators, even against their early predilections, to interpret them exclusively of him; the events of his history alone answer to the words of the Psalmist. And yet the advocates of the double sense have so completely inverted the truth and order of things, that they not only consider the events of David's life to have been equally predicted with Christ in those prophetic Psalms, but they call the former their literal, and the latter their figurative or secondary sense; the only sense the words can, after a rigid analysis, be made to bear, is named the figurative, while that which they merely bear by torture and constraint, is viewed as the literal. This is surely a ludicrous mode of developing an author's meaning.

"Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption: thou wilt make known to me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore." These words, in the 16th Psalm, were applied by the apostle Peter determinately to Christ, on the plain and intelligible ground, that the facts of his history alone corresponded with them. He contends that David could not there speak of himself, for neither had he been prevented from seeing corruption, nor had he ascended (i. e. in complete, glorified humanity) into the heavens, the region of God's immediate presence; in short, he intimates, that the literal meaning of the Psalm did not hold concerning David, and therefore concludes it to have referred to the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the only events in which it did hold. But what says Warburton of the freedom from corruption, the deliverance from hell, and return to the paths of life, of which the Psalmist speaks? "Though it literally signifies," says he, "security from the curse of the law upon transgressors, viz. immature death, yet it may very reasonably be understood in a spiritual sense of the resurrection of Christ from the dead; in which case, the words or terms translated *soul* and *hell* are left in the meaning they bear in the Hebrew tongue of *body* and *grave*." He elsewhere admits, that Peter claimed the passage as a prophecy of Christ's resurrection; but contends, that he does so, "no otherwise than by giving it a secondary or spiritual sense." What may not be made of the words and authority of Scripture, if

such liberties are to be taken with them? In such a style of interpretation one cannot but feel as if the terms *primary* and *secondary*, *literal* and *spiritual*, had come unaccountably to change places with each other,—since the application to Christ is the only one the prophecy can properly and directly bear, while the application made of it to David is entirely forced and unnatural.

Were it necessary, the same objection might be urged with equal propriety against other examples commonly produced by the advocates of the double sense. They never hold in both of the relations, so that it can be fairly said, the prediction has in each received a fulfilment conformable to its terms. There may be, as there doubtless are, for example, in the concluding part of Isaiah's prophecies, announcements of a general and comprehensive kind, of which the accomplishment may be sought in the events connected with the return from Babylon, as well as in those which were to distinguish the work and kingdom of Christ. Embodying rather great truths and principles of government, than individual and specific acts, they may be said to belong to that class of prophecies, which have "springing and germinant accomplishment." But even in regard to these the design and scope of the prophecy requires their being viewed in the light represented above,—as suggested, indeed, by the events of the Babylonish captivity, and deriving from these somewhat of their distinctive character, but strictly and properly fulfilled only in the transactions of gospel times. The full and literal import of the words in the main stream and current of this part of Isaiah's prophecies, can find its accomplishment in nothing short of the great realities of the gospel. Even Vitringa, whom we had formerly occasion to characterize as unduly fond of double meanings and mystical interpretations, here distinctly rejects a primary application to the affairs of the Jewish people, on the express ground, that the language of the prophet, and the assertions of New Testament writers regarding particular parts of his discourse, will not admit of it. He tells us, that he can find no intimation of Babylon, or a return from Babylon, in the commencing words of the prophet; that the language used is such as naturally to beget the idea, not of the people going to dwell with God, but of God coming to dwell with them,—not of a way being prepared through a foreign region for their marching to Jerusalem, but of a way prepared in the land and cities of Judea for the manifestation of a present God; and that the express reference of the voice crying in the wilderness to John the Baptist, and of the everlasting word of God, as opposed to the perishing nature of flesh, to the gospel of Christ, in New Testament scripture, preclude the supposition of any thing being understood here but the things of Christ's kingdom. In short to adopt the summary of this able and learned commentator, the subjects handled by Isaiah, not spiritually and mystically, but directly and plainly, are "the great mystery of the manifestation of the kingdom of God and his righteousness in the world through the Messiah, his forerunner, and apostles, with the revival of an elect church, then reduced to a

very small number, with its more remarkable preceding signs, and the means that should be subservient to the whole work of grace, —among which preceding signs the deliverance from Babylon by Cyrus, in connexion with the destruction of Babylon itself, as typical of the overthrow of all idolatrous and Satanic power, are chiefly dwelt upon, in like manner as the conviction both of Jews and Gentiles concerning the vanity of idols and the truth of God and his spiritual worship, hold the most prominent place among the concurrent means."

Gathering up what has been advanced against the double sense, we hold, 1. That it so ravels and complicates the meaning of the prophecies, to which it is applied, as to throw the greatest doubt and obscurity over the interpretation of their several parts. 2. Or supposing this to be avoided, it at least requires them to be of so general and comprehensive a nature, as in great measure to prevent their affording any decisive proof of divine foresight and interposition. 3. And finally, that in point of fact, when applied to particular examples, the theory must be practically abandoned, as the terms employed in all the more important predictions are too definite and precise to admit of more than one proper fulfilment.

2. We come now to offer a few remarks on the method of interpretation, which has usually been adopted by those, who hold only the single sense of prophecy. The chief objection with which such interpreters, as a class, are chargeable is that, not taking sufficiently into account the connexion that subsists between the Old and the New Testament dispensations, they have generally given but a partial view of the relations borne by individual prophecies, and in many cases have considered the immediate relation, that is, the connexion which a certain prophecy had with events under the Old Testament, as the only one which properly belonged to it, while, in reality, such things only supplied the occasion of its deliverance, and the peculiar form or type into which it was thrown. The single sense contended for, has thus often become the ground of obscuring, or entirely subverting the real sense. For when the primary and alone proper sense of such prophecies was sought in some immediate temporal transactions, they could admit of no legitimate application to gospel times, and if found with such an application in Scripture itself, it must necessarily be by a mere accommodation of their words to other objects, than those to which they originally and strictly referred. In this way the passages, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," "A bone of him shall not be broken," "I will open my mouth in parables," &c., have commonly been denied by advocates of the single sense, to have any thing prophetical about them; for, descriptive as they certainly were of things occurring in Jewish times, it were to endow them with a double meaning, if they might be understood as also referring to the events of Christ's history. And not only such Scriptures as these, but many of the predictions of Isaiah, and the other prophets, and most of the Psalms of David, have in like manner been stript of their evangelical import, on the ground that the prophet or psalmist must have had in view cir-

cumstances immediately affecting himself or his countrymen, and that if his words were intended to delineate these, they could not in strict propriety be regarded as descriptive of similar things happening under the gospel.

We could scarcely, perhaps, have a better example of the way in which the school of interpretation, now in question, are accustomed to deal with these portions of the prophetic volume, than in their mode of handling the well-known prophecy in the 7th of Isaiah. As the common version differs in one or two important particulars from the correct rendering, we give it in the version of Lowth: "Behold the virgin conceiveth and beareth a son, and she shall call his name Immanuel. Butter (rather milk) and honey shall he eat, when he shall know to refuse what is evil, and choose what is good; for before this child shall know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good, the land shall become desolate, by whose two kings thou art distressed." We are expressly told by Matthew, chap. i. 22, that the circumstances connected with the miraculous conception of Jesus, were ordered with a view to the fulfilment of this prophecy: "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled," &c. And the prediction itself seems perfectly to harmonize with this statement, and even to admit of no inferior application;—for that a *virgin* (almah, never used but of an unmarried young woman,) should conceive, and that the child should bear the name of *Immanuel*, is undoubtedly true in the literal sense of no virgin but Mary, and no child but Jesus. "The prophecy," as Bishop Lowth has well stated, "is introduced in so solemn a manner; the sign is so marked, as a sign selected and given by God himself, after Ahaz had rejected the offer of any sign of his own choosing out of the whole compass of nature; the terms of the prophecy are so peculiar, and the name of the child so expressive, containing in them much more than the circumstances of the birth of a common child required, or even admitted; that we may easily suppose, that in minds prepared by the general expectation of a great deliverer to spring from the house of David, they raised hopes far beyond what the present occasion suggested; especially when it was found, that in the subsequent prophecy, delivered immediately afterward, this child, called Immanuel, is treated as the Lord and Prince of Judah. Who could this be, other than the heir of the throne of David? under which character a great and even a divine person had been promised." This clear and convincing statement bears some respect to the theory of a double sense, adopted by Lowth generally, and in reference also to this particular prediction. The objections already made, however, to the double sense in general, apply with special force here; and it is obvious, on the slightest reflection, that the prophecy cannot hold in two references according to the real import of its terms. But in reading out this import, the greater part of those who reject the double sense, can find nothing more in it than the following: that a young person, then a virgin, should be married and have a son, and that by the time this son should have arrived, through the richest nourishment, at some

measure of discernment, that is, in the course of about three years from the time the prophet spake, the king of Judah should be relieved of any further danger or annoyance from the confederate bands of Israel and Syria; for by that time these should be discomfited, and their land laid desolate. But how then is the credit of the evangelist to be saved, who in such emphatic terms asserts the reference of the prophecy to Christ? Sometimes they scarcely even try to save it, merely asserting, like Grotius, that the evangelist applied it in the mystical sense to Christ, in other words, put a sense of his own upon it, different from the real one; and sometimes a canon of interpretation is brought in for the occasion, "that when prophecies of future events are expressed in language more elevated and full, than the particular objects contemplated demands, (that is, happen to suit some other things fully as well as what they were really meant to predict,) then, *they may be said* to be fulfilled in the latter." (Barnes on Matthew.) How far such miserable shifts are from properly vindicating the evangelist from what such writers must regard as a mistaken or improper use of the prophecy, may be left to the unbiassed reflection of every candid mind.

But the sense thus put on it, is equally far from meeting the plain import and proper design of the prediction; as we may see by viewing it in connexion with the circumstances in which it was uttered. The confederacy between the kings of Syria and Israel against Judah had struck, we are told, the most appalling terror and dismay into the heart of Ahaz and his people; "his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind."* In these circumstances, the prophet is sent with a message of comfort, predicting in the plainest terms, that the threatened desolations were not to take place at present, and by the instrumentality of these kings; so far from it, that these kings were themselves only as the ends of two smoking firebrands, that would soon be extinguished, and that the kingdom of Israel in particular should cease in sixty-five years to have a being. The prophet, not only pronounced this message of deliverance, but offered, in the name of Jehovah, to confirm it by some miraculous sign, which was to be left to the choice of Ahaz himself. Instead of doing this, however, he assumed an air of sanctity and declined, as being quite satisfied with the simple affirmation of the prophet, and unwilling to put God to any unnecessary proof. His mind meanwhile was going in an entirely different direction; for with that distrust of God, which the ungodly man ever has, especially in times of real danger, he had resolved to look elsewhere for help, and was caring for no assurances of support, but what he might get from the king of Assyria, (2 Kings xvi., 2 Chron. xxviii.) In-

* In all probability the terror was heightened by the knowledge of those prophecies, which Isaiah had previously uttered, and which, being chiefly remarkable for the severe denunciations they contained against the sins of the people, and the fearful desolations that were to be sent in chastisement of their guilt, might naturally have given rise to the impression, that now the time of vengeance was come.

dignant at this hypocrisy, and descrying in the fleshly confidence, which lay at the bottom of it, the true source of danger to the house of David and the people of Jerusalem, the prophet then proceeds to rebuke the iniquity of those around him, and proclaims from the Lord a sign—a sign, indeed, of the Lord's covenant-love and faithfulness to his people, but at the same time, as the circumstances might have led us to expect, a sign of his indignation and judgment toward an apostate house of David, and such as followed in their crooked ways. He tells them, that if from any quarter danger might be apprehended by the heritage of God, it was not as from God himself,—that so far from his being disposed to give them up, without cause, a prey into the hands of their enemies, he was going to come nearer to them yet, than he had ever done before,—that the great promise of a Deliverer and glorious King to be raised up in the house of David, so often substantially made already, should certainly be fulfilled, and fulfilled by God himself, in very deed, entering into the womb of a virgin, and dwelling amongst his people,—but that so little would this wondrous manifestation of faithfulness and love, on the part of God, impart to the house of David then existing, and the present or immediately following generations of Israel and Judah, that before the Immanuel should appear, the land of Israel should have become a comparatively forsaken, desolate region, and the land and people of Judah be ravaged and destroyed by merciless conquerors, consumed by the fly of Egypt, and shaved by the razor of the king of Assyria. Therefore, O wicked prince of the house of David, and misguided inhabitants of Jerusalem, your present fear and confidence are alike misplaced;—what you have mainly to dread, is not the already doomed and miserable people of Ephraim, who in a few short years are to be swept from their place, but the rival powers of Egypt and Assyria, especially the latter, which ye are now foolishly confiding in, as the grounds of safety and support; if ye were wise, your fear would be directed toward these as enemies of the cause of God, your confidence placed solely upon *his* arm of strength; and only to those, who have learned such divine wisdom, shall the fulfilment of God's grandest promise bring safety, deliverance, and blessing.

This mode of bringing out the real meaning of the prophecy, which seems to me the most simple and natural, differs in some particulars from those commonly adopted. What has very much, and in my opinion unnecessarily embarrassed the subject, is the idea, that the sign, as ultimately given, must have been somehow designed and fitted for the present assurance and comfort of Ahaz and his people regarding the dangers, with which they were then encompassed. In order to make out this, the advocates of the double sense think the prophet must have had in view a twofold set of objects,—a virgin conceiving then, (of course in the usual way,) and bearing a child, who should be a pledge of the Lord's presence to help and deliver, and all this as the type and earnest of a similar, though higher class of things in gospel history. Many

of those, who hold to a single sense, consider the prophet, as we have said, to have had in view only the first class of objects, and in these find its proper fulfilment. But others, as Vitringa, Hengstenberg, and several of the ablest commentators, who hold to the single sense, and regard the prophecy as exclusively pointing to the other, the gospel class of objects, still labour to explain the miraculous conception and birth of the Messiah, as intended for a sign to Ahaz and his people of present deliverance. Here is the grand difficulty,—and how do they remove it? How can they make a distant series of events, simply predicted, with any propriety appear to be a sign of other events immediately in prospect? They suppose, that the predicted conception and birth of Immanuel, being seen in vision or ecstasy by the prophet, was regarded by him as in a manner present, and that he hence fixes the short period, which in his mind's eye he saw to exist, between the conception of the child, and his discerning between evil and good, as the period within which the hostile confederacy should be broken:—an involved and artificial device, and scarcely compatible with the integrity of the prophet. For if the people had really understood him to refer to those historical facts concerning the Messiah, as notes of time regarding the confederacy, would they not have been justified in believing, that the promise was instantly to be fulfilled,—that the conception and birth of Immanuel were presently to become facts in history? Or, if guarded against this, then how strange and unnatural, to have a succession of facts, existing as yet only in idea, in reality many centuries distant, set up as landmarks for determining the time of events at the very door! I believe this to be without a parallel in the whole prophetic record, and without a foundation in reason. The whole difficulty is avoided, if we take the *sign* in a right point of view, which is well-known to be employed with considerable latitude; while the very manner of its introduction here, naturally leads us to think of a somewhat unusual or extended application of it. The house of David would not have a sign in the ordinary sense,—therefore they must have one of a different sort,—one, the direct object of which should not, as is generally imagined, be to inspire them with confidence and hope, (the time was now gone by for that,) but to fill them with fear and trembling. This seems to be the fair and natural import of the prophet's address, which in its immediate design portended evil and not good; as is also confirmed by the evident reference to the prediction in Mic. v. 3, where its most obvious and leading purport is expressed by "the giving up of the people, (that is, to troubles and calamities of various sorts,) till she which travailed had brought forth." In chap. viii. 14, we find a precisely similar prediction of Messiah, coupled with threatening and rebuke to the people, as in many other places. What is then to be regarded as the sign, is not the mere fact of Immanuel's conception and birth, but the whole burden of the prophecy,—the severity it denounced against unbelieving and faithless transgressors, as well as the goodness it showed to be in reserve for a God-fearing and chosen remnant.

The prophecy also should be viewed as one to the end of the chapter, not as closing, according to the common view, with ver. 16; the prophet merely pauses there for a moment, and resumes his word of threatening, with a special application to Ahaz and his people. His object throughout is only incidentally, as it were, to foretell the birth of Immanuel, but directly and properly to disclose the state in which the houses of Ephraim and Judah should be, when that event should take place. He says nothing precisely as to the time of its occurrence, but declares that *when* the child should be old enough to choose its own food, (Lowth's rendering here we take to be the correct one,—for the mere infant does not choose its own food, nor can properly be represented as having any food, but what it draws from its mother's breast,) instead of finding himself in a densely-peopled, fully-cultivated country, as those regions then were, he should live on milk and wild honey, the natural products of a land that has been devastated, and which spontaneously yields more than its few inhabitants can consume. This must be the meaning of the eating milk and honey; for the coming desolation of the land is given as a reason of it, in v. 16: "he shall eat, &c., for the land shall be desolate." And the same image is repeated in ver. 21, 22, concerning the land of Judah, as the former was said concerning the lands of Ephraim and Syria, lest Ahaz and his people should imagine, that no such desolations were to overtake their territory; the whole region was to share substantially the same fate, and the different parts of it are mentioned successively, only because the circumstances naturally led to their being thus particularized. Of course the eating of milk and honey is merely given as an indication of the previous calamities that should have befallen the country,—an individualizing of the intermediate desolations, not that there was any necessity for Immanuel actually living on such fare. And the whole put together, the work of judgment to be executed on the land for sin, along with the ultimate fulfilment of God's great promise of a deliverer for those who truly waited for it, is called God's sign to Ahaz and his degenerate people,—the only one he could now give, since their own perversity and wickedness prevented him from granting another, which might have been altogether gracious in its character and object.*

Thus we see how the direct reference of this prophecy to Christ is borne out both by a faithful interpretation of its terms, and by a comprehensive view of the circumstances in which it was spoken.

* The proper meaning of the prophecy has often been obscured, by supposing, that what is said in the next chapter, about the prophet's son, has respect to the child here spoken of, seeing its birth and name were to be as a sign of deliverance from the Syrian invasion. But, as Hengstenberg has said, "it rather refutes the notion of Immanuel's being the prophet's son, (or that of any other person then living;) as it is not probable, that the prophet would have given two of his sons symbolical names, which related to the same event; while it is entirely suitable to the Messianic interpretation, that a visible sign should have been added to the invisible one, which consisted solely of the promise." We should say the threatening, as well as the promise,—for it was in the former character, rather than in the latter, that God now spake to the mass of the people: as appears from the general strain of chap. viii., not less than of the concluding prophecy in chapter vii.

And we should find the same in regard to many other prophecies, which the class of interpreters now referred to have been wont to explain of inferior and earthly affairs, did it consist with our plan to examine them in detail. It has been done, indeed, in a masterly style by Hengstenberg, in his Christology of the Old Testament—a work of inestimable value. It is a book that cannot fail to exert a powerful influence in producing a sounder style of criticism on the prophecies, not only as opposed to the groundless notion of a double sense, but also, and still more, as opposed to the prevalent errors of a mistaken single sense. Even before it made its appearance, a reaction had begun to take place on the Continent, where this erroneous mode of interpretation had its ablest advocates; and both Rosenmuller, in his last edition of his Commentary, and De Wette, had felt themselves constrained, against all their early predilections, to look for the plain and literal fulfilment of prophecies in the events of Christ's work and kingdom, which they once interpreted of other and inferior events. Generally speaking, however, their theory of interpretation is open to the objection of not sufficiently taking into account the typical connexion between the circumstances from which the Messianic prophecies took their rise and their form, and the events which they predicted. They look, for the most part, too exclusively to the word of prophecy itself, and view it too much apart from those outward transactions, past or future, which formed in fact a parallel prophecy in action, and constituted the ground and pattern, as well as occasion, of the other. They run, in short, into the opposite extreme of those, who maintain the double sense, and treat the prophecies, which look so like descriptions of events in Jewish history, that their application to these has been considered by many as their primary and proper sense, as if they stood altogether apart from such events. We cannot enter into particulars; but must state, that the defect in question can scarcely be said to have an existence in the work of Hengstenberg—although we conceive that there is not quite so broad and *definite* a place frequently given to the transactions of Old Testament history, as in this point of view is due to them; and hence they are sometimes spoken of as mere images of gospel things, and sometimes as themselves imperfect fulfilments of gospel promises. This appears especially in some portions of the remarks made on the concluding portion of Isaiah, where such constant references occur to the deliverance from Babylon. That deliverance, with the issues growing out of it, like the earlier deliverance from Egypt, was a manifestation on the terrene and outward field of a present providence, of truths and principles, which were waiting to receive their higher and grander development in Christ's kingdom. Hence, the prophetic vision, while rising aloft into the higher territory and bringing into view what belonged to that, yet, seeing in the lower the type and pattern of what was to come, took from that its hue and aspect, still speaking, however, of the realities of the heavenly kingdom, and in these alone finding its intended fulfilment. But of this we have already spoken.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PLACE DUE TO THE SUBJECT OF TYPES AS A BRANCH OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY, AND THE BENEFITS IT IS FITTED TO YIELD, WHEN RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD AND APPLIED.

The loose and incorrect views which have been so long current regarding the types, and which have latterly taken a course that tends at once to abridge their number and lower their importance, have well nigh succeeded in bringing the whole subject into discredit, and left it little more than a nominal place in our more recent theological systems. For any real value it possesses as a mode of divine revelation, or any substantial benefit to be derived from becoming acquainted with the information it conveys, we search in vain amid the writings of many of our most approved interpreters and systematic divines. The manner in which they for the most part discuss it, is rather negative than positive; they dwell more a great deal upon the abuses, to which it may be carried, than upon the advantages, to which it should be applied; and were it not for the purpose of exploding errors, delivering cautions, prescribing limits, and disowning unwarrantable conclusions, one is tempted to think, that the subject would not have been admitted to any special consideration at all.

If the discussion pursued through the preceding chapters has been prosecuted with any success, it must have tended to beget a very different impression, and suggested various points of great importance, with which the typical character of ancient scripture is so intimately connected, that, apart from it, they cannot be seen in their proper light, or just magnitude. Were it only from the connexion in which the subject stands with prophecy, and the light it throws, when properly understood, on the structure of many portions of the prophetic record, it would well deserve to have its title vindicated to a high and important place in the theory of revelation. On the service which the typology of scripture is thus capable of rendering to its prophecies, we have already dwelt at sufficient length, nor shall we now revert to it; but there are other points not hitherto noticed, at least not distinctly brought out, in the preceding investigation, and some of them, at least, of vital moment, which it may be necessary to open up at some length, before we proceed to the second great division of our subject—the practical application of our views and principles to the typical matter of ancient scripture.

I. There is an analogy in the methods of instruction, which we may expect to find in the communication of God to his church at different times, and which it is important for us to mark. In *one* short period of its history, the New Testament church might be

said to hold a close resemblance to that of the Old Testament, as to its capacity for receiving divine truth, and the manner in which it might require this to be communicated to it. The period we refer to is the one which embraces the personal ministry of our Lord, during which events were preparing for the actual establishment of his spiritual kingdom, and his disciples were undergoing the discipline which was to fit them for taking a part in its transactions. When the kingdom was fully set up, with its clear manifestations of gospel truth, and its large dowry of the Spirit of grace, the church passed into a new condition; she became possessed of the understanding, the freedom and dignity of manhood, consequently released from the imperfection and restraints of childhood, to which she had hitherto been confined; and as our Lord, during the period of his personal ministry, had to form and elevate the minds of his immediate disciples, so as to fit them for passing out of the one condition into the other, we are naturally led to expect, that his mode of teaching would bear in its leading features some resemblance to what was adopted toward the Old Testament church as a whole, while it was undergoing a similar, though immensely more lengthened process of preparation for "the dispensation of the fulness of times."

Now the great peculiarity, as we have endeavoured to show, of God's method of teaching in regard to the Old Testament church, consisted in its being chiefly conveyed through symbol and action. The grand truths and principles of evangelical doctrine were, indeed, taught the members of the church; yet not, as now, in plain and direct statements, but by means of outward events and solemn rites; they were incessantly flowing in upon them from the history of providence, and the institutions of worship. For the practical guidance and direction of their conduct they were furnished with many lessons of instruction, the most literal and express; but for the enlightenment of their mind in the sublime mysteries of divine truth, and the leading characteristics of the divine government, the instruction they received was not literal and express, but veiled and figurative; it addressed itself to the eye, rather than to the ear; it came intermingled with things seen and felt; and while it made them of necessity familiar with the general forms of truth and principle, which pervade the economy of grace, it left them, by a like necessity, in great measure ignorant of the precise facts and operations, through which these were chiefly to be realized and developed.

How entirely analogous was the course pursued by our Lord toward his immediate disciples during the period of his personal ministry! We cannot say, indeed, that plain and direct teaching was totally excluded, but with very few exceptions it was chiefly employed in inculcating the lessons of moral truth and commanded duty,—clearing away the false glosses with which a corrupt priesthood had allowed these to be perverted or impaired, and disclosing the extent of pure and spiritual attainment, which was to be sought from the members of his kingdom. But in regard to what may

be called the mysteries of the kingdom,—the all-important facts on which it was to be founded, the kind of operations in which it was to proceed, and the hidden life, which its members should be called to maintain, no direct instruction of any moment was imparted up to the last night of our Lord's earthly ministry. On one or two occasions, when he sought to convey plain information concerning these, the disciples either entirely misunderstood his meaning, or showed themselves quite incapable of profiting by his instructions, (Matth. xvi. 21—23; Luke xviii. 34; John ii. 19—22; vi.) And in his last discourse with them he declared, that "he had yet many things to say unto them, but that they could not bear them," and these, therefore, were reserved for the teaching of the Holy Spirit, "who should lead them into all the truth." But shall we on this account conclude, that our Lord's disciples got no instruction of any kind, while he was with them, concerning the mysteries of the kingdom? Far from it. They were *every day* receiving instruction,—but that conveyed, as in the case of the Old Testament church, through action and symbol, or more correctly, through actions and allegory, which supplied the place of symbol, and was intended to work in a similar manner upon their minds. The *doings* of Jesus were in this respect so many means of information; the whole tenor of his life was an instruction; every action was a type in history; and hence he appealed, in his last discourse with his disciples to the works he had done in their presence, as "having revealed to them the Father." For in these they had seen all the principles on which God was to act in his dealings toward men, and on which he was to rear the constitution of his everlasting kingdom, most uniformly and gloriously displayed,—his untainted righteousness, repelling every form and pollution of sin, coupled with the most yearning love and compassion to sinners,—his boundless beneficence toward the needy and distressed, yet his solemn regard to his own honour in the distribution of his gifts, dispensed, as they ever were, only to the thankful and lowly hand of faith,—his ability to prevail over all the power of the enemy, and retrieve the most inveterate forms of corruption, while they, in whose behalf his grace wrought such mighty deeds, were still left beleaguered with temptation, and appointed in deepest humility to bear the contradiction of sinners. These, and such like lessons of heavenly instruction, were constantly pouring in upon the minds of the disciples from the events of every day's ministration on the part of their Divine Master; and thus they became familiarized to ideas and principles, which needed only to be applied to the higher interests of the soul and the loftier concerns of eternity, to fit them for entering with enlightened spirits into the scenes and labours of Christ's spiritual kingdom.

It was but another department of the same kind of teaching, being intended, in like manner, to reach the understanding through the visible representation of inferior, but similar and parallel things, which was adopted by our Lord, when he resorted to the parabolic

method of instruction. For his adversaries, this adoption of the parabolic style was employed in the way of judgment, as a solemn rebuke for their obstinacy and perverseness of heart; but for his own disciples it was taken as a cover for presenting to them more truth concerning the kingdom, or impressing on them a more full and distinct idea of its leading features, than otherwise they were capable of receiving. The parables were to the disciples in the stead of symbolic representations, conveying under the shell of an outward and familiar form the kernel of evangelical doctrine; histories, drawn from the ordinary field of providence, of the divine economy, as about to be unfolded in Messiah's reign, which the simplest could understand, and which, like the types of an earlier dispensation, needed only to be interpreted by the facts of gospel history, to render the minds, which had received them, well instructed in the nature of the kingdom, and fully reconciled to its spiritual and heavenly truths. In short, our Lord found his disciples like children, too carnal and contracted in their views, to receive the things of his coming dispensation in their unveiled and naked form, and therefore he subjected them to a course of educational training, in which, by means of the actions of his own life and the delineations of historical narrative, he made them acquainted with such views and principles as tended to prepare them for apprehending clearly in their own minds, and unfolding to others, the higher facts and operations of the work-and kingdom of God.

Thus we see how precisely similar was the method of teaching and preparation adopted toward the first disciples of our Lord, during *their* short period of special training for a New Testament church and ministry, to what had been adopted toward the church of the Old Testament at large, during *her* long period of waiting expectation for the good things to come. The analogy arising, as it does, from a uniformity of plan pursued in circumstances so altered, and through periods so widely different, is such as clearly bespeaks the consistent working and presiding agency of Him, "who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." We may be little able to explain why in either period such a method was pursued; but compared together, they mutually support and throw light on each other. Pursued during the space of three years with the disciples, and that space occupying the whole term of Christ's personal ministry on earth, we may be the less surprised, that it should have been pursued during so many generations before his arrival. And seeing, on the other hand, that for so many generations the church was confined to such childhood training and instruction, accustomed only, through the facts of outward history, and the rites of symbolic worship, to apprehend the main ideas and principles of God's everlasting kingdom, while the precise events and operations in which these were to receive their necessary and proper development, were little, if at all known to her,—shall it seem strange, and be taken as a just exception against the peculiar doctrines of the gospel, that these were only taught as in a mystery, not brought distinctly and prominently out, during the com-

paratively brief space of our Lord's triennial ministry? An objection of this kind has sometimes been urged by Socinians, and other opponents of evangelical truth, who would fain have Jesus regarded as nothing more than a moral teacher, and seek to bring into discredit the fundamental doctrines of his gospel. "Can such doctrines," they ask, "so much insisted on by Paul and the other apostles and teachers of Christianity, be really so essential to the system of its original author, when he himself spake so little about them,—never, indeed, distinctly unfolded them during all the time of his earthly sojourn?" Look to the analogy of God's dealings with his church, and let that supply the answer. Christ and the things of his salvation were the end of the whole Old Testament worship, and yet centuries of preparatory instruction and discipline were not thought too much before the things themselves were brought distinctly into view. And can it be deemed strange or unreasonable that those, who were first to embrace and promulgate them, should have been kept for the space of three years in a similar course of preparatory instruction and discipline? The peculiar doctrines of Christianity are founded upon the *facts* of its history; and until these facts had actually taken place, as the doctrines could not be distinctly understood, so they could not be directly and plainly taught; they could only be impressed upon the mind in their essential elements or ground-ideas through actions and symbols, types and parables; and it results as much from the absolute necessity of things, as from the choice of its divine Author, that the mode of instruction, which was continued through the lengthened history of the Old Testament church, has its parallel and counterpart in "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ."

II. But there is an analogy of faith or doctrine, which is of more consequence than any analogy that may appear in the methods of instruction. It is not unimportant to observe, how at similar, though distant periods, like methods or channels of communication were employed by God for informing the minds of his people with spiritual light; but it is greatly more important to know, that, so far as communicated, the truth of God has been always one; that the earlier and the later, the Old and the New Testament churches, however different in other respects, agree in this, that the members of both have been called to see substantially by the same light, to walk by the same rule, to possess and manifest the same elements of character. This we can only learn by a proper knowledge and understanding of the typology of Scripture, for it is through that alone we can become rightly acquainted with the truth communicated, received and acted on, under the earlier dispensations of God.

In New Testament scripture, we find not unfrequently the *differences* between the earlier and the later dispensations more insisted on, than their *resemblances*. A necessity for this arose from the abuse which had been made by the Jews of the things belonging to the Mosaic economy—who, in the grossness and carnality of their minds, mistook the means for the end, embraced the

shadow for the substance, and converted what was set up for the express purpose of leading them to Christ, into a mighty stumbling-block to obstruct the way of their approach to him. On this account it was necessary to bring prominently out the differences between the preparatory and the ultimate schemes of God, and to show that what was perfectly suited to the one, was quite unsuited or opposed to the other. But there were, notwithstanding, many real agreements of a most important and fundamental nature between them, which also are referred to in many portions of New Testament scripture. Moses and Christ, when closely examined and viewed according to the inward meaning and substance of each, are found to teach the same doctrine; the law and the prophets of the Old Testament, and the gospels and epistles of the New, exhibit but different phases and operations of the same glorious scheme of grace; the light varies from time to time in its force and clearness, but never as to the elements of which it is composed; and the very differences, which broadly distinguish the gospel dispensation to the outward view from all that went before it, when considered in connexion with the entire plan and purpose of God, become evidences of an internal harmony and fundamental agreement.

We cannot here enter on the full investigation of this topic, as the truth of it can only become fully apparent from the careful examination of the whole typical matter of ancient Scripture. But we may take one point in illustration, and that one, which shall carry us into the very heart of the subject. What, at first sight, can present a more striking difference between the Old and the New dispensations, than the prominent place given in the one to the doctrine of a future state, coupled with the silence or reserve maintained regarding it in the other? The eternal world comes constantly into view in the Scriptures of the New Testament; all the doctrines, motives, and precepts of the gospel are in a manner entwined with it; it meets us in every page, inspirits every character, imparts a high and ennobling impress to the whole form and framework of Christianity. Nothing of this, however, is to be found in the earlier portions of the word of God. We cannot say, indeed, that there is no intimation in any part of Old Testament scripture, embodying a plain and unequivocal belief in the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. The untenableness of such an extreme position, which once formed the subject of a warm controversy, does not call for any particular exposure now.

But the fact, so far as we acknowledge and are concerned to account for it, is so palpably true, that it cannot be denied. The doctrine of a future life of rewards and punishments never was broadly proclaimed in the revelations of Old Testament scripture, —has no distinct and easily recognised place, either in the patriarchal or Levitical dispensations,—is never advanced as a formal ground of action, or inculcated as a religious belief,—is rather implied, than distinctly affirmed, excepting when it occasionally

appears among the confessions of pious individuals, or the later announcements of prophecy; all indicating, that while it could not but have some share in the believing apprehensions of God's people in every age, there yet was a studied caution and reserve maintained concerning it by God in his divine communications, even up to the time when Christ came, "bringing life and immortality to light."

Now this difference between the Old and the New Testament revelations has generally been regarded as presenting a serious difficulty in the way of a harmonious and satisfactory reconcilement between them, and has given rise to various theories of explanation, into which it is quite unnecessary at present to enter. We believe, however, that a right understanding of the typology of Scripture is the *only ground* on which it is possible to raise an explanation thoroughly consistent and satisfactory. For leave this out of view,—suppose, that God's method of revelation and dealing to the Old Testament church did not entirely proceed upon the plan of conveying gospel ideas and principles through means of common events and fleshly symbols, but admitted of these being unfolded in their unveiled simplicity and proper fulness, then it will be next to impossible to account for such profound silence and reserve being maintained for many centuries on so important an article of faith as that of a future state of reward and punishment. But, on the other hand, let it be understood, that the kind of teaching which God adopted for the Old Testament church, in reference to gospel things, mainly consisted in typical transactions and symbols, then not only was the absence of any direct information concerning a future state capable of being reconciled with the divine plan, but absolutely necessary to its existence. It would not have been suitable to the church in such a condition, but a gross incongruity, warring with the very principles of her constitution, had "things eternal and invisible been immediately and nakedly propounded to her, or otherwise than under the figures and shadows of temporal and visible things."* For the doctrine of a future state, as revealed in the gospel, stands inseparably connected with the facts of Christ's death and resurrection; the one could not be plainly and distinctly announced without a similar announcement having been made of the other; and so, the whole scheme of a typical and preparatory dispensation would have been destroyed in its foundation, we should rather say, could not have existed.

But if it really was the purpose of God to place his church for a considerable period under such a dispensation, as a fit training and preparation for the coming and reign of the Messiah,—and if it were the object of this dispensation, as we think it must have been, to exhibit through many carnal ordinances and providential arrangements the same primary truths and principles which were to receive their full and only adequate manifestation in the king-

* Gillespie's Aaron's Rod Blossoming, p. 52.

dom of Christ;—if this were indeed the purpose and object of God in his mode of dealing with the Old Testament church, then the exclusion of any direct reference to the eternal world, not only may be sufficiently accounted for, but is seen to have been a matter of absolute necessity. The introduction of this, in any thing like a distinct or palpable form, would have completely changed the aspect of the earlier dispensation, and defeated its design. Instead of paving the way and serving as a preparatory course of discipline and instruction for the dispensation of the gospel, it should then have run into the latter, and with ordinances suited to a temporary, would have had the light properly belonging to a complete and finished revelation. The ancient church, having her faith professedly directed upon the eternal world, would no longer have preserved, in her *outward* and *earthly* history, the palpable manifestation of divine truth and principle; the work of God regarding her would have passed into the region of the inner man; she would have had her spiritual experiences, her hidden life, her internal conflicts with the powers of darkness, her avowed disregard of a present, her habitual pursuit of a future, inheritance. In short, the essential distinctions between a fleshly and a spiritual dispensation, between a preparatory and a perfected work of God, would have been confounded, and violence done to the regular and orderly course of the divine procedure toward his church.

Did we want a proof of this confusion, and the mischievous consequences naturally resulting from it, we have only to look to the history of the later Jews. For not understanding, like our modern infidels, the exact place designed to be held by the Mosaic dispensation, and the absolute necessity of a veil being thrown during its continuance over the eternal world, they fell into the most grievous and fatal error concerning it,—mistook it for the permanent and final, instead of the transient and preparatory, constitution of God's kingdom,—under this persuasion rejected Him, who came to make all things new, and treated it as the deadliest heresy, to say that "the customs which Moses delivered to them should be changed." How should they have come so entirely to misapprehend the purport of Moses, and foolishly embrace the shadow he had delineated for the perfect substance? Their error stood in regarding that outward dispensation as by itself making a suitable provision for eternity; and what mainly tended to draw them into this error, we have no hesitation in saying, was the comparative clearness of their knowledge and belief respecting a future state. The later scriptures spake out plainly upon this subject, and an open, avowed expectation of a resurrection from the dead, and an endless life thereafter of happiness or misery, had become one of the leading characteristics of the Jewish church. So much was this the case, that the apostle Paul could think of no way more likely to gain for himself a favourable hearing before a Jewish council, than to represent his cause as one which involved the question of "the hope and resurrection of the dead."

Now all this had been well, and should have but prepared for

Christ's person and work a more hearty, as well as enlightened reception, if they had borne in mind, that the knowledge they had acquired of the world to come was a superadditional light to that which shone from the face of Moses, and that the higher things which concerned it required also a higher economy to provide for them, than the carnal institutions set up by Moses. But not distinguishing the things that differ, they mixed the whole up with the Mosaic dispensation, as if it had been there they derived the views they cherished of an immortal life, and there also they were to look for whatever they needed to prepare them for its glories. And had they been right in their premises, it had been impossible to have proved them wrong in their conclusion. For if the Old Testament economy had contained the express promulgation of an eternal world, or if its ordinances had proceeded on a distinct recognition of its concerns, then those who lived under it would plainly have been warranted and bound to regard it as making of itself adequate provision for what it so obviously contemplated; and the proposal to do it away as unprofitable, or to supplement it, as inherently defective, with something better, must inevitably have appeared a reflection on the wisdom of the Mosaic economy, as if it had coupled things together, which were in themselves incongruous,—connected with the end proposed, means wholly unfit for reaching it. The conviction was not less just than natural, that if the doctrine of immortality was there, as an essential and proper element, provision for immortality must have been there also,—in other words, if the distinctive revelations of the gospel had been bound up with the law of Moses, its peculiar apparatus for the redemption of sinful men must also have been interwoven with the institutions of Moses. To present the one without the other, could only have served to beget the impression, that no other was really required, and that whatever purposes the Messiah might come to accomplish, one of them could not be to provide for higher interests than those which the Mosaic dispensation professed to have in view, and consequently not to supplant its observances. Thus the twofold error of first exalting that dispensation to an undue rank, by looking to it for blessings it was never intended, unless typically, to impart, and then to misapprehend the grand purpose for which the Messiah was to come in the flesh, must have been the certain result of a broad revelation of the doctrine of immortality by the hand of Moses. This is precisely what happened, when the later Jewish church, misled by its growing knowledge of the life to come, came to place his carnal and shadowy ordinances in immediate contact with their prospects of an hereafter. Their increasing knowledge in this respect, not being accompanied by the spiritual discernment and life of faith, proved, in fact, to be the greatest temptation.

However strange, then, the silence preserved in God's earlier revelations regarding a future state may at first sight appear, it necessarily arose from the plan he resolved to pursue. It was not an accident or an oversight, far less an unaccountable blunder, as

has often been represented, but a matter of wise and skilful arrangement. And instead of bringing into doubt the divine original of the word of God, it should rather be added as one more to the many proofs of its undeniable truth and internal harmony. For when viewed in connexion with the real design and full compass of the divine plan, the clearer light we would in this respect have desiderated, could only have led to confusion and error.

It is certainly not, however, in the Warburtonian sense, that we hold this to furnish a proof of the verity of God's ancient word, and along with that of the divine legation of Moses. His argument, which proceeds on the ground of nothing being written in Scripture before the period of the later prophets, which clearly implied the doctrine of immortality, and of the absolute ignorance of the mass even of good men in Jewish and patriarchal times of such a doctrine, we believe to be not only baseless in itself, but utterly repugnant and opposed to the real truth. This we trust to be able to show at large, in the views afterwards to be exhibited of the truths necessarily involved in the earlier facts of revelation and symbols of worship; and in particular, when we come to speak of the hope of the inheritance under the first dispensation. It may be enough to say at present, that we hold it to be clear as day, from the necessity of things, and from the intimations of Old Testament scripture itself, that godly and believing men of old did, from the very first, feel themselves to be but pilgrims and strangers on earth, and did habitually seek for a heavenly country. The promises given them of good things to come were so framed as to force on them the conviction and hope of immortality. The sacrifices and services of their fleshly ritual were also calculated, and that just because they were throughout so manifestly fleshly and earthly in their immediate object, to deepen that conviction and hope in the bosom of all intelligent and believing Israelites. For with the knowledge they had of the evil of sin, and the impressive views which were given them in the law itself, of its enormity and hatefulness before God, they could not but be convinced, that so bodily a service provided for it a remedy too meagre and inadequate to be the ultimate one of God. They must have understood that redemption in its full and proper sense was another thing, than what they saw immediately represented there. But however much they did understand of another life, and a higher provision for the wants of their nature, than could be found in the ordinances of a sacrificial worship, the discovery of this could not be formally brought out in the records of God; their knowledge must have been held, so to speak, in a mystery. Though they could not have been men of faith and spiritual discernment, without being persuaded of the hope and resurrection of the dead; yet how far they were enabled to penetrate beneath the cover of sensible things, and what precise measure of light they really possessed at any particular time regarding the world to come, is not, and could not, with propriety, be disclosed to us in the original testimony, which the Spirit of God has given of their faith and

character. Nor is it of any importance, that we should have had such particular information; we do not require it to perceive the essential identity of their condition and ours. For, living as they did under a dispensation which was throughout typical of spiritual and eternal things, the carnal ordinance was to them in the room of the spiritual thing it represented, and the earthly Canaan in the room of God's everlasting kingdom; and this being the case, the relation in which they stood to the one produced substantially the same views, feelings, dispositions, and conduct, which is produced by the other; that is, the former, when rightly acted on and improved, led to the same interest in God's favour here, and the same fitness for a happy destiny hereafter, which also results from the latter.

And this, indeed, is the great thing, in regard to which there is a perfect agreement under all diversities of light and administration. The discoveries which God gives of himself, and the measure of divine truth in general, which he imparts to the church, may be considerably different in one, from what it is at another period of her history; but it must at all periods be such as to beget one character, and lead to one result, on the part of those who receive it. The *gifts* of the Spirit, and knowledge among the rest, are distributed not uniformly to all, but to every man, and consequently to every period of the church, "severally as he will;" but the *fruits* of the Spirit in the heart, conduct and experience of believers, have always been, and must always be, the same. For the state and character of believers, as renewed and sanctified by the Spirit, is the reflected image of God,—and therefore can never be materially different, under whatever measure or manifestation of the truth produced; since in character, as in being, God is without variableness or shadow of turning. And as meetness for the future inheritance of glory consists, not so much in any precise amount of information concerning it—for even now we see "as through a glass darkly"—as in a faithful reception of God's declared testimony, and a corresponding behaviour, we can easily understand how believers in former ages, with their dim light and carnal services, might yet become well prepared for the mansions of glory. Though not specially called to direct their views thither, and with comparatively slender means of information regarding what was there to be inherited, they were still children of the light, having received the testimony of God, and taken the course which that prescribed. They were not only, like ourselves, men of faith, but in them also, though in a different, that is, a more outward and sensible manner, faith had its trials and dangers, its discouragements, its warrings with the flesh and the world, its times of weakness and of strength, its blessed satisfactions and triumphant victories; so that while babes, comparatively speaking, in their knowledge and apprehension of divine things, they yet possessed all the essential marks of a gospel character, had every thing needed to fit them for fellowship with God, and an inheritance with them that are sanctified; and when taken from the scenes and objects, amid

which, and toward which, their faith had here displayed its heaven-derived energies, they were ready to pass into the heavenly Canaan, though it might be, as Abraham, into the earthly Canaan—scarcely knowing whither they went.

Thus we see, in one important particular, how much depends upon giving to the typical character of ancient Scripture its due place of importance, and how differences between the Old and New Testament revelations, which might otherwise seem very strange and unaccountable, admit, when viewed through this medium, of a most natural and satisfactory explanation. Were it necessary, the same might be shown in regard to many other points of scarcely inferior moment. And indeed, it is only by coming to an intelligent and proper understanding of the typical import of God's earlier revelations and dealings, that we can truly harmonize at all Moses and Christ,—a carnal and preparatory, with a spiritual and perfected economy. In the outer shell and framework, in the precise amount of knowledge communicated, and the manner in which it is communicated, there must of necessity be many obvious differences, and even striking contrarieties between them. But view them in their mutual relations and corresponding parts,—consider the fundamental truths and principles which they embody, and the moral effects they were designed and are fitted to produce, —in a word, view the one as type, and the other as antitype, in the proper sense of the terms, and a deep-laid, harmonious agreement will be found subsisting between them; an analogy of faith, a correspondence of aim and doctrine discovers itself, not only from Moses to Christ, but from Genesis to Revelation; and all things in the word and dispensations of God may be said to bear witness to Jesus, for they all either point the way to and terminate in his work and kingdom, or else spring out of and illustrate them.

[The explanation given above of the silence observed respecting a future state, will be seen, I trust, to have nothing in common with the views of those, who would account for the introduction of merely temporal rewards and punishments being propounded in the books of Moses, from the necessity of assimilating every thing in the Mosaic economy to the notions and services of the heathen. Spencer's leading ideas on the subject, are, so far as the Israelites were concerned, that at the period of their deliverance from Egypt, they were so gross and sensual in their dispositions, so glued to the flesh and the world, that nothing but earthly rewards and punishments would have had the slightest effect upon them; and—which is just another shape of the same argument—that as idolworship owed its influence chiefly to the apprehensions of present good and evil, which its supposed deities were believed to have at their command, so the tendency to idolatry among the Israelites, required to be met by temporal threatenings and promises, (De Legib. Hebr. L. I. c. VI.) As if God sought then to attach men to his service by *any sort* of means, or were content to receive from them a formal homage, no matter how essentially low and carnal their hearts still remained! Or, as if the best way to wean the

heart from a fleshly disposition, were to confine its view to the things which are directly fitted to feed and nourish such a disposition! Or, finally, as if the most effective method of arming men against the temptations of idolatry, were to put his own worship on a level with it as to reward and punishment, and not rather to carry their views far above and beyond the short-lived possessions of earth, to unspeakably brighter glories than idolatry could ever unfold or promise to its votaries! Why is idolatry so little now a snare or temptation to the people of God, but from the clear discoveries which are laid open in the gospel of the eternal world? It is this, which enables the merest babe in Christianity to despise the fooleries of idol-worship; and so also would it have enabled the unlettered Jew, had it been accordant with the scheme of God to grant the same in like measure to him.—It is rather surprising, that so sensible a writer as Graves, should, to a certain extent, have given his sanction to such low and unworthy views. For among the secondary reasons which he advances for the employment merely of temporal sanctions, he mentions "the intellectual and moral character of the Jewish nation, which was totally incapable of that pure and rational faith in the sanctions of a future state, without which these sanctions cannot effectually promote the interests of piety and virtue. Their desires and ideas being confined to the enjoyments of the present world, they would pay little attention to the promises of a future retribution, which they could never be sure were fulfilled," &c. (Vol. II. p. 222.) To be sure, *if* their desires and ideas were, and must have been, confined to a present world,—but why that *if?* How could their desires and ideas embrace another world, if no such world were really disclosed to them, and all insight into futurity purposely withheld? Would it not have been the most likely way to give their desires and ideas a loftier direction, to unfold to them the knowledge of a higher state of being? And is it for one moment to be supposed, that the Israelites, after a course of regular discipline and training under the hand of Moses, were incapable of receiving and profiting by the light, which can now find an entrance into the bosom of the most unlettered savages, had such light been fairly imparted to them?—Not to enlarge, however, in the disproof of so shallow a notion, which implies, it will be observed, the absolute ignorance on the part of the ancient Israelites of a future state of reward and punishment,—an opinion utterly incredible and positively false, as we shall show in its proper place,—we would allude for a little to what is regarded by Graves, and the majority, we believe, of the later English writers, as the main reason for the silence observed by Moses in respect to a future state. "I contend (he says, p. 208,) that the reality of an extraordinary providence being established by unquestioned authority, and by the general nature of the Mosaic code, we can thence satisfactorily account for the omission of a future sanction, and that this is *the only way* in which it can be accounted for; so that such omission, far from being inconsistent with the divine origin of the Jewish dispensation, results

from the operation of that extraordinary providence, which attends such divine original." *The only way* of accounting for it! Why, it does not account for it at all. An extraordinary providence carrying along with it the most exact distribution of temporal reward and punishment, simply proves the truth and reality of a temporal sanction; but so far from being inconsistent with the belief of a future state of reward and punishment, it should rather have been regarded as the surest foundation and stepping-stone to such a belief. On this point Hengstenberg justly remarks: "Where this foundation (i. e. of a moral government on earth, a temporal recompense,) is not laid, there the building of a faith in immortality is raised on sand, and must fall before the first blast. Whoever does not recognise the temporal recompense, must necessarily find in his heart a response to the scoff of Vanini at the revelation, 'which promises indeed retributions for good and bad actions, but only in the life to come, lest the fraud should be discovered.' One may find in Barth on Claudian, p. 1078 sq., a rich collection from heathen authors, in which a doubt regarding a future state of recompense is raised on the ground of unbelief as to the temporal one. And does not the history of our age render it clear and palpable, how closely the two must hang together? The doubt was first directed against the temporal recompense, and it seemed, as if the belief of immortality were going to rise, in consequence of this very misapprehension, to a higher significance and greater stability. Supernaturalistic theologians themselves, such as Knapp, and Steudel, derived a main argument in proof of a future, from the want of a present recompense. But the *real* consequence was not long in discovering itself. The doctrine of reward, driven from the lower region, could not long maintain its ground in the higher. It became manifest, that the hope of immortality had fed itself with its own heart's blood.—'If ye enjoy not such a recompense on earth,' says Richter, justly according to the conceptions of the age, 'God is by no means truly righteous, and you find yourselves in opposition to your own doctrine.'—Where the principle, that the world's history is the world's judgment, is first of all heartily received in the true, the biblical sense, there an advance will inevitably and certainly be made to faith in *the* (final) judgment of the world." (Pent. II. p. 573.)

This is just, indeed, the argument of Butler, so admirably handled in the second and third chapters of the first part of his Analogy; and it may well excite our surprise, that especially English divines, who must be well acquainted with the line of demonstration pursued in that masterly treatise, should suppose an extraordinary providence, or an exact distribution of reward and punishment here, to militate against either the revelation, or the belief of a future state of rewards and punishments. It is precisely the want of exactness in these temporal distributions, according to the usual course of providence, which mars the completeness of Butler's argument. Yet as it is, he does not hesitate to draw from the present aspect and constitution of providence the following conclusions: First,

that the Author of nature is not indifferent to virtue and vice; second, that if God should reward virtue and punish vice, as such, so that every one may upon the whole have his deserts, this distributive justice would not be a thing different in *kind*, but only in *degree*, from what we experience in his present government. It would be that in *effect* toward which we now see a *tendency*. It would be no more than the *completion* of that moral government, the *principles* and *beginning* of which have been shown, beyond all dispute, discernible in the present constitution and course of nature. And from hence it follows, thirdly, that as, under the natural government of God, our experience of those kinds and degrees of happiness and misery, which we do experience at present, gives just ground to hope for and to fear higher degrees and other kinds of both in a future state, supposing a future state admitted; so under his moral government, our experience that virtue and vice are actually rewarded and punished at present, in a certain degree, gives just ground to hope and to fear, that they may be rewarded and punished in a higher degree hereafter. And there is ground to think that they actually *will* be so, from the good and bad tendencies of virtue and vice, which are essential and founded in the nature of things; whereas the hinderances to their becoming effect are, in numberless cases, not necessary, but artificial only; and it is much more likely, that these tendencies, as well as the actual rewards and punishments of virtue and vice, which arise directly out of the nature of things, will remain hereafter, than that the accidental hinderances of them will.

On the whole, therefore, we should certainly conclude, that the temporal sanctions of the Mosaic economy, or its connexion with an extraordinary providence, were the very reverse of being inconsistent with the full knowledge and persuasion, consequently with the clear revelation, of a future world. So far from it, indeed, that we should think it impossible for any intelligent Israelite to have lived under the operation of these temporal sanctions, and from that source alone have failed to imbibe the hopes and fears belonging to an eternal world. In the one he possessed the sure ground and necessary elements of the other.—It is somewhat surprising, that one of the latest treatises on this subject, from the pen of an English divine, should still entirely overlook the view of it now presented, and resume substantially the ground occupied by Warburton. We refer to the Essay by Archbishop Whateley on the Revelation of a future state, in the first series of his Peculiarities of the Christian Religion. He does not, indeed, like Graves, place the temporal rewards and punishments in direct antagonism to the expectation of a future state; but neither does he make any account of the former as laying a sure foundation for the latter, and forming a sort of stepping-stone to it. His line of argument rather implies, that it would have the reverse tendency, and that the Jews were only prepared to receive the doctrine of immortality, when their peculiar temporal blessings ceased, § 10. He holds it absolutely incredible, that the Israelites as a people should have

looked for an after state of being, from their attention being so very rarely, at least, if at all directed to such a state, seeing that they so seldom believed the temporal promises and threatenings, though so frequently pressed upon them and so much more easily believed, and also from the difficulty of getting men, even under the clear sunshine of the gospel, to embrace the prospects of a future life. But in this he evidently confounds two things, the speculative knowledge and belief, with the living faith, of futurity; for on the same ground that he denies the hope of immortality to the Jewish dispensation, he might of course also deny it in great measure to the Christian. Besides, he is after all obliged to admit, that somehow the doctrine and belief of a future state *did* become prevalent long before Christ,—an admission, which totally destroys his great argument; for unquestionably this prevalent belief sprung up and was maintained without the doctrine being *frequently* inculcated in any authoritative Scripture. It also destroys his argument from 2 Tim. i. 10; for if the knowledge of a future state existed at all before Christ, it could not be said, that he brought it to light, in the sense in which Archbishop Whateley understands it—that is, in the sense of discovering what was wholly unknown. The assertion of the apostle evidently means nothing more than this, that Christ has brought a clear and full light to bear upon the things of immortality, which hitherto had been in comparative obscurity; he has brought them distinctly into view, and set them, as they never were before, in the foreground of the kingdom of God; and we have no more reason to maintain, from such a declaration, that all was absolute darkness and ignorance before, as to hold, from John i. 9, where Christ is said to be "the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," that before his appearance there was no true knowledge whatever in the world of God and divine things.]

III. Very nearly connected with this, yet at the same time distinct from it, is another benefit arising from a right understanding of the typical character of ancient Scripture—a benefit specially connected with the historical types. For it is only when viewed in this light, that the narratives of Old Testament history can acquire their proper dignity, value, and importance.

There were undoubtedly *many* ends to be served by the records of Old Testament history, and we must beware of making so much account of one, as to depreciate or overlook others. There is a use of no mean value even in their least interesting and instructive parts—the genealogies, with which they are interspersed. For dry and barren as these for the most part seem, they yet afford some valuable hints concerning the earlier portions of the world's history, and are of especial service to the church, as providing her with the means of identifying Him that was to come, not only as in general the Redeemer of man, but more specially as the seed of the woman, the descendant of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, of the stock and lineage of David. And for the other portions of inspired history, which contain notices of the life and behaviour of

so many individuals, portray the manners and customs of such different ages and nations, and disclose the dealings of God toward his people, and his successive communications to them through a great variety of states and circumstances—how precious and important these are in many points of view, as mere records of the past, and apart altogether from any immediate connexion they may have with gospel times, no reflective mind can need to be informed. They are, even in that respect, a vast storehouse of valuable information and practical instruction, and can never fail to be found by the prayerful and attentive reader to be "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and for instruction in righteousness."

Yet if viewed only in that light, we scarcely perceive one half their worth; the proper importance of the things they record is not understood, nor can we discern the essential distinction, which exists between these and other events of history, in themselves not less, or perhaps even more important. For with all the lights of knowledge and lessons of practical instruction, which lie scattered over the pages of Old Testament history, how trifling often are the incidents recorded! how small and confined the track over which it ranges! and, in regard, at least, to certain portions, how easy might it seem to have selected other histories, which should have been equally instructive, while they led the mind through scenes more dignified in their nature, and less frequently intermingled with evil! It is well known how often the infidel has given to such reflections an obnoxious form, and sought to take advantage of them, for the purpose of bringing the Bible into discredit as the revealed word of God. But in doing so, he has only displayed, as in other things of a like nature, his ignorance or unfairness in handling the word of God,—wresting one part of its contents from their proper connexion, and thus placing them in a false position, that they might be made to reflect unfavourably on the character of the whole. For let the notices of Old Testament history be viewed in their real connexion with the scheme of grace revealed in the gospel,—let the field, which it traverses, however limited in extent, and scenes which it delineates, however unimportant to the natural eye, be regarded as that field and those scenes, through which, as on a lower and common ground, God sought to make his people familiar with the truths and principles hereafter to be developed in the events of his everlasting kingdom,—let this view be taken of the notices of Old Testament history, which is the one Scripture itself requires us to take, and then how high a character does not one and all of them come to possess! What a dignity and importance attaches even to the least of them! The smallest motions on the earth's surface acquire a sort of greatness, when regarded as examples of the law of gravitation, since then even the fall of an apple from the tree appears connected with the revolution of the planets in their courses. And, in like manner, the relation which the historical facts of ancient Scripture bear to the glorious work and kingdom of Christ, gives to the least of

them such a character of sacred dignity and importance, as brings them within the range of God's highest purposes, and renders them "in reality the connecting links of that golden chain which unites heaven and earth."

This, however, is not all. A right understanding of the typical nature of ancient Scripture is certainly valuable, as serving thus to impart an air of grandeur and importance to its smallest incidents, making the little relatively great, and showing how a place may have been given to them in the sacred record, without in any measure impairing its dignity or lessening its value. But the same consideration warrants us to proceed a step farther, and to assert, not only that such things *may* without impropriety have been admitted into Old Testament history, but that they *must* have been found there, in order to adapt it for fulfilling the ends it was intended to serve. The comparatively little and homely appearance of a great proportion of the things recorded in sacred history, was absolutely necessary to render them what they were designed to be—the natural and easy stepping-stones by which the church was to be led on to the discoveries of a higher dispensation. It is one thing, that an arrangement exists in nature, which comprehends under the same law the falling of an apple to the ground, and the vast movements of the heavenly bodies; but it is another thing, and also true, that the perception of that law, as manifested in the motion of the smaller body, because manifested on a scale which man could bring fully within the grasp of his comprehension, was what enabled him to mount upwards and scan the similar though incomparably grander phenomena of the visible universe. In this case, there was not only a real connexion in nature between the little and the great, but also such a connexion in the order of man's acquaintance with both, that it was the knowledge of the one which conducted him to the knowledge of the other. The connexion is precisely similar, which exists between the facts of Old Testament history and the glorious revelations of the gospel,—with this difference, indeed, that the laws and principles developed amid the familiar objects and comparatively humble scenes of the former, were not so much designed to fit men for discovering, as for receiving when discovered, the higher mysteries of the latter. To do that, however, it was not less necessary in this case, than in the other, that the first developments should have been made amid such familiar objects and humble scenes as those in question—amid the ordinary occurrences of social and domestic life, or the current transactions of an earthly kingdom. A series of events more grand and majestic could never have accomplished the object God had in view; they would have been too much away from the common course of things; and though they might have commanded the interest and dazzled the imagination of those, who either witnessed or read of them, they could not have implanted truths in the hearts of God's people, and familiarized them to principles, which were, not only in point of fact, but in the apprehension also of their minds, to be most intimately connected with God's chief and ulti-

mate purposes of grace. Such an effect could be produced only by such a series of transactions as those we find recorded in the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and thus, what the loose and partial views of superficial men would turn into a ground of accusation against the oracles of God, becomes, when thoroughly investigated, an evidence of the profound wisdom and internal harmony, which render them as a whole worthy of God, and in one part properly subservient to another.

It may be proper just to mention, that though in the above remarks we have spoken of the purpose of God only in reference to those who lived in former times, yet there would be no material difference, if the subject were contemplated in reference to those who live now, or at any period of the Christian dispensation. For what the transactions themselves required to be for the accomplishment of God's purpose in regard to the one, the history of these transactions required to be for the accomplishment of his purpose in regard to the other. Whatever confirmation such things may lend to our faith in the mysteries of God—whatever force or clearness to our perceptions of the truth—whatever encouragement to our hopes, or direction to our walk in the divine life, it may all be said to depend upon the history being of such easy comprehension, and descriptive of facts so plain and familiar in their nature, that the mind can without difficulty both realize their truth and grasp their dimensions.

IV. We have yet another, and perhaps a still more important observation to make, than any of the preceding, on the value of the typical matter of ancient Scripture, and the services which, as such, it is fitted to render in connexion with the knowledge and belief of divine truth. For when rightly understood and employed, it is eminently calculated to enlarge and strengthen our faith in the things of God, by helping out the imperfection of the spiritual idea in our minds, and presenting it before us in its proper fulness. Our views in many important points must otherwise be very defective, and our convictions less settled than they ought to be.

We have now, it is true, the advantage of a full revelation of the mind of God, and it is the privilege even of babes to understand the mysteries of the kingdom of God. But it by no means follows from this, that every portion of the truth may be so distinctly apprehended in its naked spirituality, as to render us totally independent of any outward and sensible representations of it. We are still in a state of imperfection, and so much under the influence of sense, that our ideas even of abstract truth in nature require often to be aided by outward forms and resemblances. And how much more must it be so of such truth, as, from being in its own nature spiritual and divine, is less easily brought within the grasp of the mind, than what is merely natural! Besides, there are portions of the truth which relate to things still future, and do not come at all within the reach of our present observation or experience, though not the less important to be contemplated and believed by the church. It might greatly tend to assist our concep-

tion of these, and strengthen our faith in the certainty of their coming existence, if we could have the privilege of looking on some plain and obvious representation of them prepared before by the hand of God. Now the typical transactions of ancient Scripture are fitted, as they were no doubt from the first designed, to be of much service in both of the respects now mentioned; as we shall proceed to show by a few examples, referring first to truths affecting the present state or condition of believers, and then to those, which bear on the future history of the kingdom.

1. Our first example, under the former of these classes, is one that will lead us to explain a very generally misunderstood passage of Scripture. This passage is found in 1 Pet. i. 2, where, speaking of the state and calling of believers, the apostle describes them as "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." It is only the concluding part of this description—"and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ"—which calls for any particular remark at present, and which, from being represented as the end to which believers are not only elected of the Father, but also sanctified by the Spirit, seems at first sight to be out of its proper place. When we think of the blood of Christ, it most commonly is in reference to the pardon of sin, or to the efficacy of his death in blotting out transgression, and providing for the guilty a sure ground of reconciliation with God. And we may remark in passing, that even with respect to that effect of his blood, however clearly revealed in other parts of Scripture, it is no small advantage to the faith of Christians that they can view it in connexion with the work of the yearly atonement, as described in the 16th chapter of Leviticus, and explained in the 9th chapter of Hebrews. The simple and easily realized transactions of the type, exhibit an outward scale and pattern by which the mind can more distinctly picture to itself the spiritual and heavenly things involved in the antitype.

It is obvious, however, that the sprinkling mentioned in this text of Peter, is not that which stands connected with the forgiveness of sin or justification,—although it is so regarded by nearly all the older, (among others Leighton,) and most even of the later expositors,—for it is coupled with *obedience*, as denoting something of the same nature with itself, and together with obedience is represented as the end or result, for which an interest is obtained both in the electing love of the Father and the sanctifying grace of the Spirit. The benefit here spoken of, then, is not external, but inward and personal; it is not wrought for us, but performed in and by us; pre-supposing, therefore, our justification through the atoning blood of Jesus, but itself belonging rather to our sanctification, nay, the highest part, as it were, and perfected result of this. What then is it? No new thing certainly, but one often set forth in the most plain and explicit terms; and yet the idea, in its proper fulness, is so spiritual and sublime, that we need the help of the ritual type to assist our otherwise faint and imperfect notions of it.

"The blood of the yearly sacrifice was divided (as previously at the altar in the wilderness, Ex. xxiv. 6—8,) into two parts, of which the first served for sprinkling the tabernacle before and behind the vail, and especially the mercy-seat; the other afterwards for sprinkling the people, (Lev. xvi. 14—19.) Now, if we represent to ourselves the whole work of redemption, in allusion to this rite, it will be as follows: The expiation of one and of all sins, the propitiation, was accomplished when Christ offered his blood to God on the altar of the accursed tree. That done, he went with his blood into the most holy place. Whosoever looks in faith to his blood, (Rom. iii. 25,) has part in the atonement; that is, he is justified on account of it, receiving the full pardon of all his sins, (Rom. v. 9.) Thenceforth he can appear with the whole community of believers, (1 John i. 7,) full of boldness and confidence before the throne of grace, (Heb. iv. 16,) in order that he may be purified by Christ, as high-priest, from every evil lust."* It is this personal purifying from every evil lust, which is described by Peter in ritual language, as "the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," and which is also described in the Epistle to the Hebrews, with a similar reference to the blood of Christ, by "having the heart sprinkled from an evil conscience," and again, by "having the conscience purged from dead works to serve the living God." The purging or sprinkling spoken of in all these passages, is manifestly an internal effect, making the soul free from the yoke of sin, fitted and prepared for the work of righteousness; the instrument, by which the purifying effect is produced, is also in each case declared to be the blood of Jesus applied to the conscience of believers, and as such, therefore, serving another purpose, and operating to a farther end, than when simply viewed as providing the pardon of iniquity.

Now, this important truth is certainly taught without either figure or ambiguity in the gospel of the grace of God. As when it is written of believers, that "God purifies their hearts by faith;" or when it is spoken of as the end, for which he bore death "in the body of his flesh, that he might present us holy, unblameable and unrebukable in his sight;" or when the heirs of his purchased possession are represented as "purifying themselves as he is pure;" and in every passage, in short, which connects with the death of Christ a real purity of heart and conduct, as the personal experience of those who believe upon his name. I can understand the truth, even when thus spiritually, and if I may so say, nakedly expressed; but I feel that I can get to myself a more clear and comforting apprehension of it by reading its full and graphic delineation in the visible type. For with what effect was the blood of atonement sprinkled, not only upon the mercy-seat, but also upon the tabernacle itself, and afterwards upon the people? The effect was, that the sacred virtue of the blood did thereby pass over into these; they partook of its ceremonial holiness—the one hence be-

* Steiger's Com. on 1 Pet., as translated by the author, in Vols. XIII. and XIV. of Clark's Biblical Cabinet.

coming a fit dwelling-place of Godhead, and the other as consecrated vessels prepared for standing in his presence, and being employed in his service. Such precisely, though in a much higher, because a spiritual sense, is the effect of Christ's precious blood sprinkled on the soul,—the essential purity of the one comes to be possessed by the other. It is much assuredly for me to know, that by faith in his blood the crimson-guilt of my sins is blotted out, Heaven itself reconciled, and the way laid freely open for my entering into the holiest of all. But it is much more still for me to know, that by faith in the same blood, ministered by the grace of the Holy Spirit, I am made a partaker of its sanctifying virtue; the very holiness of the Holy One of Israel passes into me; his life-blood becomes in my soul the well-spring of a new and heavenly existence;—so that by continually repairing to this fountain of life, I can there find deliverance from the moral defilement of my nature, can walk amid the holy light of heaven, can hold fellowship now with the God of light, and shall hereafter pass into the region of his immediate presence clothed with the purity of his own eternal Son, and therefore fit to be glorified with his glory. To one who knows how essential the connexion is both between sin and evil, and between holiness and blessing, this is indeed a most precious and comforting truth; for it declares a fellowship with the moral purity of Christ to be as much the fruit and privilege of faith, as an interest in his justifying righteousness; and amid the imperfections of our personal experience, and the clouds ever apt to arise in the soul from remaining sin, it well becomes us to thank God, that he has presented to our view an image of the truth in all its greatness, as we are thus made clearly to understand how high in this respect is the hope of our calling, and assured, as by a solemn pledge from the hand of God, that nothing shall be withheld from us, which is necessary to perfect that which concerneth us.

The example now considered will surely be allowed to afford a convincing proof of the importance of typical studies, both for obtaining a correct knowledge of the language of Scripture, and for entering aright into the full meaning of its truths. Let us take, however, another example, not from the ritual, but from the historical parts of the Old Testament, and, like the former, illustrative of a truth connected with the present condition of God's faithful people. How often do we find it affirmed to be the distinguishing privilege of such, when they lay hold of the covenant of God in Christ, that they are thenceforth admitted to hold free and familiar fellowship with God—permitted to regard him as their friend, having his secret with them, enjoying a state of reconciliation and peace with the very highest of his creatures! Nothing can be more certain than that this friendly connexion and high communion with all in God's kingdom is possessed by those who by faith in Christ have entered into covenant with him. But amid the trials and imperfections of life, the disturbances which are apt to assail us both from within and without, and the depressing influence which these tend to produce upon the mind, it is often far from being

easy to feel assured of possessing, or even to apprehend with clearness, what is so heavenly and elevating. And if we can find in the transactions of former times an outward and palpable representation of it, prepared by the hand of God, we may surely obtain by reflecting on that both a more vivid conception of the idea, and a more confident assurance of the blessed things it discloses to the eye of faith. Such a representation we actually have in the history of Abraham, after the covenant was formally made with him, and his faith in its provisions had become properly enlightened and matured. The picture is drawn in the 18th chap. of Genesis, where he is seen walking with heavenly freedom and elevation, as the friend of God. A cheerful serenity and satisfaction of spirit shines through the whole of his demeanour. With a princely grace and hospitality he receives strangers into his tent, and "lo! he received angels unawares;" nay, the Lord of glory himself is there, though in the form of man, yet speaking with the authority and exercising the prerogatives of Godhead. Abraham has the unspeakable satisfaction of entertaining heavenly guests; he is joined to the society of angels; he sees with open eye, and converses with God face to face; he is honoured with an insight into the divine counsels, and as a days-man between God and the children of disobedience, stands up to plead for mercy, and endeavours to avert the impending visitations of wrath. For Abraham himself, what a high preferment! what a commanding position! what a glorious freedom and companionship! But it was no singular distinction which was then held by him; it was only possessing in the outward and visible transactions of an earthly pilgrimage, what is now, in the hidden and spiritual life, common to every child of Abraham, to all the members of the covenant. The sphere which they occupy, is the blessed region of God's presence—a region where angels visit, where "beams descend from the eternal Son," where the heart, with childlike liberty, is ever free to breathe forth its spiritual desires and affections, and ever privileged to receive back, as from an open heaven, the rich communications of a Father's love. A condition so full of honour and enlargement, and reaching so much into the unseen and eternal world, however distinctly announced and freely offered, is not one to which we can readily familiarize our minds while still in the infirmities of flesh; and the outward delineation given of it in the earthly history of the patriarch, may fitly serve as a help to aid our conceptions of its nature, and strengthen our faith in its reality.

Thus may the typical transactions of Old Testament history, and its symbolical institutions, be made to contribute most materially to the proper knowledge and perception of New Testament truths,—even of such as are most plainly revealed there, and enter into the present experience of believers. For not only do they throw much light on the terms in which the doctrines of the gospel are unfolded, but they also embody the ideas themselves, in such a distinct and tangible form, that the mind can frame to itself

more vivid perceptions of them, than it could otherwise do, and with increased confidence can make them the objects of its faith.

2. But there are revelations in the gospel, which point to events still future in the history of God's church and people; and in respect to them the typical delineations of ancient Scripture, if rightly understood, are capable of rendering still more important service. For the objects referred to in this case being entirely remote from present observation or experience, there is a difficulty in apprehending them not found in regard to the former. And besides, like the revelations of the gospel in general, the events of which they make promise are very different from what the common prospects of the world, or the natural stream of occurrences, would lead us to expect; so that we stand in need of something to deepen our convictions of their certainty, as well as to inform our understandings of their nature.

The future things, to which we now advert, are not the last issues of eternity, which are to disclose themselves when the revolutions of time shall have reached their final close, and the Son himself shall have delivered up the kingdom to the Father. They are events, of which this present earth is to be the theatre, and are to fill up the latter portions of Christ's mediatorial reign. This perspective ground has unhappily been made the subject of much debate. Every line almost of the prophetic future, being too often measured by the scale of human probabilities, stands connected with so many questions of doubt or difficulty, that one is at a loss on what precise portion of it to fix, as containing a plain description of things certainly to be verified in the transactions of a coming age. Yet there are some general points concerning Messiah's future reign, on which the word of prophecy utters so clear and determinate a sound, that with intelligent and sober Christians there should be little doubt or diversity of opinion about them. It is not, for example, a more certain mark of a predicted Saviour, that he should be a despised and rejected man—that he should personally pass through the deepest sufferings, and find it possible to reach the seat of universal sovereignty only by vanquishing many powerful and determined enemies, than that he should thereafter destroy the dominion of these enemies throughout the earth, bring their schemes of evil to a perpetual end, extend his church over all lands, and render the condition of her members replete with the highest honour and blessing. For my own part, I should as soon doubt that the first series of events was the subject of prophecy as the second; and for breadth and prominence of place in the prophetic record, the latter is at least not inferior to the former. But how far is the present aspect of the world from showing their fulfilment? Nay, how unlikely does it seem, if we look no higher than the mere calculations of reason and the natural issues of things, that there should ever be a fulfilment of the predictions in question?

That the progress of society in knowledge and virtue should gradually lead, however distant the period, to the extirpation of idol-

atry, the downfall of the grosser forms of superstition, and the general abandonment of the more shameful misdeeds and flagrant iniquities, we can have no great difficulty in conceiving: such a result evidently lies within the bounds of probability, though many ages may elapse before it is actually accomplished. But supposing it already done, how much should still remain to be achieved, to give the King of Zion his promised ascendant in the affairs of men, to spread through every region and establish in every bosom the righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, in which his reign essentially consists? This happy consummation might still be found at an unapproachable distance, even when the other had become a reality; nor are there wanting signs in the present condition of the world to beget the fear that it may be so. For how much is there, in the most civilized and best constituted kingdoms, utterly repugnant to the spiritual truth and government of Christ! How securely does the Man of Sin still hold his dominion, notwithstanding the many weapons with which it has been assailed, binding his captive myriads as with the chains of an interminable bondage! And even in those countries where few are subject to his soul-destroying sway, where the truth of Christ has had free course and ample opportunities for centuries to diffuse itself, how abundant still are heresies in doctrine and corruptions of life! Within the bosom of the professing church, how many things offensive to the eye of Christ, and without it, what numbers, growing by length of time rather than decreasing, who resist all the evidence which can be brought to bear upon them in favour of the gospel, and deliberately adjudge it to a place among the delusions of a too credulous age! When we reflect on all this, how hopeless seems the prospect of a triumphant church, and a regenerated world!—of a Saviour holding the undivided empire of all lands!—of an inheritance redeemed in every point from the oppression of the devil!—of a kingdom embracing in its vast domain the entire habitable globe, and enriching it all with the brightest displays of honour and blessing! The occasional triumphs which Christianity is still gaining in the world, can do little to bespeak so glorious an issue; and it seems as if other influences than any now put forth in behalf of the truth of God, should be required to verify the description of good things to come, obviously contained in the prophetic record.

Something, no doubt, may be done to re-assure the mind in regard to these prospects of predicted good, by looking back on the past progress of Christianity, and contrasting its present condition, full of disorder and imperfection as that is, with what it once was. The mustard-seed has certainly sprung into a lofty tree, stretching its luxuriant branches over the best regions of the earth. See Christianity, as it appeared in its divine Author, when He wandered about as a despised and helpless man, attended only by a little band of followers, equally despised and helpless with himself,—or again, when he was hanging on a malefactor's cross, and they, ashamed to own their connexion with him, were seeking a retreat

from the world's scorn and indignation, or even at another and more advanced stage of its early history, when its still small, but now bold and resolute company of adherents unfurled the banner of the cross, with the fearful odds every where against them of hostile kings and rulers, an incensed and degraded populace, a powerful and interested priesthood, and a mighty host of superstitions, which had struck their roots through the entire framework of society, and had become venerable, as well as strong, by their antiquity. See Christianity as it appeared then, and see it as it appears now, rearing its head over the ruins of those once strong and flourishing, but now prostrate superstitions,—planted with honour amid the thrones and dominions, which first despised and then persecuted it,—the recognised religion of the most enlightened nations of the earth, the delight and glory of the good, the study of the wise and learned, at once the source and the bulwark of all that is most pure, generous, free, and happy in the constitution of civilized society. Comparing thus what has been with what now is,—looking down from our present altitude upon the low and unpromising aspect which Christianity first assumed, we may assuredly obtain much strength to our faith and encouragement to our hopes, in regard to the far more magnificent prospects which yet wait for their fulfilment. To have reached its present commanding and honourable aspect, from such small beginnings and in the face of such mighty obstacles, may hardly seem less than to rise from the vantage-ground it has already won, to the nobler elevation it is yet destined to attain. And yet, when we compare the present aspect of affairs with the prophetic delineations of the future, there are, as we have seen, signs of imperfection and disorder, in regard to which the past history of Christianity can hardly put us at ease.

But why not revert to a still earlier period of the church's history? Why withhold from our wavering hearts the benefit, which they might derive from the form and pattern of future things, prepared centuries ago for the express purpose by the Spirit of God, in the recorded transactions of a typical history and kingdom? If we are at a loss even to conceive in its full magnitude the idea of Christ's perfected reign, and to conjecture by what marvellous combination of circumstances that idea is to become a reality, we shall find the darkness greatly relieved, and the appearances of aggravating difficulty assume a less formidable character, by contemplating the order and issue of events in the temporal kingdom, as they took place during the prophetic reigns of David and Solomon. The earlier portions, but nothing more, of David's history, have already found their counterpart. The Shepherd of Israel has been anointed King over the heritage of the Lord, and the impious efforts of his adversaries to disannul the appointment have entirely miscarried. The formidable train of evils, which obstructed his way to the throne of government, growing out of the malignant opposition of him, who already held by God's permission the power and the glory, these have been all met and overcome, and have only served to render more clearly mani-

fest the indefeasible right and omnipotent power of Heaven's anointed King. Now, therefore, He reigns on the throne prepared for him by the Father, though still not by any means universally acknowledged and obeyed—in the midst of enemies, both many and strong, secret and open, from whom the inheritance needs yet to be redeemed. And if, looking to the machinations of these enemies, and the apparent insufficiency of the gospel to make head against them, to the extent of utterly abolishing their dominion, we are ready to despair of the final triumph of Christ's kingdom, we have only to read the history of his prototype, David, to see how little real ground there is for such a conclusion.

How long was it, after David's appointment to the throne of Israel, before his reign was generally acknowledged; and after that, before the last train of events came into operation, which issued in the full establishment and general recognition of his supremacy. The course of providence for a considerable time, instead of smoothing his way to the throne, seemed rather to be accumulating new dangers and difficulties around it; nor did his affairs ever appear to the eye of man more desperate (1 Sam. xxx.) than immediately before the period of ultimate success, when God suddenly brought down his great adversary by the hand of the Philistines, and prepared for David a nearly unchallenged path to the throne of Israel. When we look back upon such things happening in the earthly kingdom, it may well abate our surprise at what the word of prophecy also leads us to expect, that before Messiah's right to reign meets with universal acknowledgment, there must be a severe and protracted struggle; and that so far from the march to universal dominion always exhibiting the appearance of onward progress, the aspect of affairs may be the most dark and gloomy near the close, and the cause of truth and righteousness become at last so encompassed with peril, that men's hearts shall be ready to fail them for fear, and the faith even of the elect have well-nigh perished. (Luke xviii. 8; xxi. 26.) But the same outline of events in the earthly kingdom may also help us to realize what is clearly foretold in many other prophecies concerning the Messiah's kingdom, that the very extremity of danger and distress, to which God's cause may be reduced, instead of being a sign that all is going into perdition, will rather, if interpreted aright, be regarded as an omen and presage of immediate deliverance; for it shall be the certain indication, that the forbearance of God toward the adversary has reached its last point of endurance, that it is now time for him to work, that he will speedily avenge the cause of his elect, and that the hour of their redemption is come.*

* See, for example, Dan. ii. 44, where the kingdom of God is represented as breaking in pieces and destroying the antagonist powers and kingdoms of this world, implying, by the violence of the action, that these latter, at the time of greatest triumph to the former, were in full force: Dan. xii. 44, 45; Ez. xxxviii. 16—23; Zech. xii. 3, 4; xiv. 1—5; in all of which places the anti-christian powers are represented as in the very height of their prosperity, rioting in their success, or even dividing the spoil—the church of God being, of course, involved in corresponding trouble and distress—when the Lord suddenly, and by a miraculous interposition of his arm, comes near to visit the adversary with overwhelming ruin, and to save his own people. See also Rev. xviii. 8; xix. 19—21; xx. 9.

This one point of resemblance between the earthly and the spiritual kingdom may suffice, by way of specimen, to show us, how valuable a handmaid to the unfulfilled prophecies of Scripture is the correct understanding of its typology. Its province does not lie, indeed, in definitely marking out beforehand the particular actions and events, which are to fill up the page of future history; the delineation of these is to be sought for in the prophetic volume, and even there a considerable degree of obscurity regarding both the individual agents, and the precise line of action they shall pursue, must be found till the course of Providence itself shall render all clear and manifest. But the typology of Scripture has fulfilled the whole, that in this respect it is either designed or fitted to accomplish, by showing, in regard to the coming events of the church's history, not the *what*, the *when*, or the *by whom*, but rather the *how* and the *wherefore*,—by exhibiting to our view (no unimportant service) on the visible scale of outward things and earthly transactions, the grand truths and principles, the general lines of dealing and modes of operation, which are hereafter to be adopted in regard to similar and corresponding, though immeasurably higher, concerns. The full proof and importance of this can only become manifest by a minute and careful investigation of the whole field of inquiry: several of its leading points will fall under our consideration afterwards; and, in the mean time, we conclude by referring, as an additional illustration, to the aid which may be derived in understanding the passage of prophetical history recorded in Zech. xii., by viewing it in connexion with a corresponding passage in typical history. Whether the prophecy in question has reference exclusively to the Jewish people or not, there can be no doubt, that it is written out in language derived from their condition, and peculiarly applicable to their future circumstances. It describes them as having been brought into a situation of greatest peril, after they had rejected the good Shepherd, and sold him as a miserable slave for thirty pieces of silver. The Lord causes their own measure to be meted to them; they become in their turn the objects of envy and bitter hatred; enemies so many and powerful assail them, that they are involved in the deepest trouble and distress, when the Lord graciously interposes for their deliverance, smiting the adversaries with confusion, and giving extraordinary power even to the weakest of the people to put to flight those that were against them. The work of deliverance and conquest is so manifestly the Lord's, that they cannot but regard the operation of his hand; and contrasting his singular and unmerited goodness to them in the hour of their need, with their former base and wicked conduct toward him, they presently fall into the bitterest self-reproach and agony of mind; they now see, that it was their best and kindest friend, their only friend in adversity, whom they had driven from them and pierced to the heart by their cruel treatment; and so, what we might have expected to be the moment of highest joy, to be celebrated by a shout of triumph, is found to them the occasion for calling

forth, through all their families, one universal wail of sorrow and anguish.

This is the delineation of what is to take place in the history of the future; how wonderfully similar, in all its leading features, to what has already taken place in the history of the past! to the circumstances, which stand recorded on the small scale of family relations and earthly circumstances, in the history of Joseph and his brethren! There also we see the one, who was peculiarly fitted, and really destined to bless the whole family, treated with cruel envy and undeserving hatred, sold by them as a slave, but only that he might be raised by God into a condition, which should enable him to serve them in the time of their greatest need. They are delivered from impending destruction, and receive all that their distressed and dangerous circumstances require,—when, lo! instead of breaking forth into songs of joy and gladness, the sudden astounding discovery of the arm that has done all for them, fills them with overwhelming sorrow and confusion. There is no room in their bosom for any feeling, but that of compunction for their past misconduct; and great as the boon is which they have received, it is for the time lost sight of under the deep sense of shame and utter amazement, which filled them on account of their behaviour toward their brother. Their grief, however, though severe and pungent, was not perpetual, nor was their wound incurable; it was but a moment of salutary pain, issuing in a state of perfect reconciliation and happy intercourse, undisturbed on their part by any of those misdemeanors, which had risen to such a fearful height in the past, and strengthened by the ties of a common interest and destiny. It would thus seem, that in drawing his delineation of the future, the prophet had been directed to keep his eye on the history of the past; and not only may that future be more distinctly realized, when thus compared with the smaller and less important transactions of the past, but the one being designed and ordained in subservience to the other, the transactions in the history should be regarded as a prophecy in action, and might be turned, not less than the prophecy in words, into valuable account, when dealing with the Jewish people in their present alienation from the true Shepherd of Israel, and with others placed in a like spiritual situation to them.

PART II.

APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES BROUGHT OUT IN THE PRECEDING INVESTIGATION, TO THE PROPER EXPLANATION OF THE TYPICAL MATTER OF OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURE.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

BEFORE proceeding to the special illustration of what is typical in Old Testament scripture, a few observations are necessary to indicate the path we mean to follow, and notice some points needing to be kept in view for its successful prosecution. In doing this, we shall not spend time in unfolding the various courses that might be adopted, and the advantages which one has over another; but shall simply content ourselves with pointing out the one we have resolved to adopt, as being in itself the most natural, and the best adapted for a full and orderly application of the principles already established.

1. As all types and symbols were parts of a religious worship or training, and must consequently be viewed in connexion with a religion then existing, as well as a religion still to come; our primary and leading divisions must be sought in the different religious dispensations. Although there were the same elements of truth at the bottom of these dispensations, yet there were also characteristic differences, wisely accommodating them to the varying circumstances of the church. It is from these, therefore, we must take our great starting-points, giving always the first place to the typical institutions which belonged to the current religion, and only afterwards, and as subsidiary to these, considering the typical transactions, which entered into the special dealings of providence therewith connected.

2. In the whole of the history that is past, we find only three grand eras, which are entitled to be regarded as forming the commencement of so many dispensations,—those, namely, of the fall, of the redemption from Egypt, and of the advent of Christ. Between the first and second of these eras, there certainly were two very important events, forming prominent breaks in the history of the period,—the deluge, and the call of Abraham. Hence, not unfrequently, the antediluvian is distinguished from the patriarchal church, and the church as it existed before, and as subsequent to the call of Abraham. But however important these events were as eras in sacred history, they mark no substantial change in the

character of the religion then established. In so far as the institutions of worship were concerned, Abraham and his immediate descendants seemed to have been on one footing with those who lived before the flood; and the new ideas evolved by the events in question, considered in a religious point of view, must have been of a secondary, not of a primary nature. The same may also be said of another great event, which formed a similar break during the progress of the second period,—the restoration from Babylon. This occupies a very distinguished place in sacred history, and in the prophetic record it stands out even more prominently than the redemption from Egypt. But still, it introduced no essential change into the spiritual relations of the church, nor altered in the very least the form of religion, under which she had to serve God. The second temple was built as near as possible after the pattern, as it stood on the very foundations of the first; and the entire round of services connected with it, was conducted in conformity to the ritual of the law of Moses. So that, as we have to do only with the preparatory dispensations, there remain simply the two grand eras of the fall, and the redemption from Egypt, as properly distinguishing periods in the history of religion, and giving rise to corresponding divisions in the treatment of our subject. The typical matter embodied in the symbols of the patriarchal religion, must first be considered, and in connexion with it the ideas developed in the transactions of a typical providence, till the events belonging to the second period began to take place; and then, commencing as from a new head, we shall come to consider the typical matter embodied in the symbols of the religion which was brought in by Moses, and which might be said to take its rise with the redemption from Egypt, viewed of course in connexion, as in the former case, with the ideas then or afterwards developed in the facts of a typical providence. This latter subject is in itself so wide and important a field, that it must be left for the present; but it is the author's intention immediately to enter on that, if the attempt now made, in the other and earlier field of inquiry, meets with encouragement.

3. Then, in investigating the import of particular types, as the first place is due to those which belonged to the institutions of religion, so our first care must be, according to the principles already established, to ascertain the views and impressions, which, as parts of an existing religion, they were fitted to awaken in the ancient worshipper. It may be impossible, of course, to say in any particular case, that such views and impressions were actually derived from them, with all the precision and definiteness, which may appear in our description; for we cannot be sure, that the necessary thought and application of mind were really directed to the subject. But due care must be taken in this respect, not to make the typical symbols and transactions indicative of more, than what *may* with ordinary measures of light and grace have been learned from them by the Old Testament believers. It is not, however, to be forgotten, that in their peculiar circumstances, much greater

progress would be made in learning divine truth through that channel, than we might at first thought imagine. These believers of the olden time were all, in the first instance, orientals, and were no doubt characterized to some extent by those peculiarities of thought and contemplation, which have been wont to distinguish the inhabitants of the east, and of which evident traces are to be found in all the religions which have emanated from that quarter. The mode of contemplation or style of thought that may be said peculiarly to distinguish the nations of the east, "proceeds on the ground of there being an inseparable connexion between the spiritual and the bodily, the ideal and the real, the seen and the unseen. According to it, the whole actual world is nothing but the manifestation of the ideal one, the entire creation is not only a production, but along with this an evidence and a revelation of Godhead; nothing real is merely dead matter, but is the form and body of something ideal; so that the whole world, even to its very stones, appears instinct with life, and precisely for that reason does it become a revelation of Deity, this being what has life essentially in itself. Such a mode of viewing things in nature may be called the peculiarly religious one; for it regards the world as a great sanctuary, whose individual parts are so many marks, words, and letters of a grand revelation-book of Godhead, in which God speaks and imparts information concerning himself. If, therefore, that which is seen and felt was generally regarded by men as the immediate expression of that which is unseen, a speech and revelation of the invisible Godhead to them, it necessarily follows, that if they were to have unfolded to them a conception of his nature, and a representation given them of what his worship properly consisted in, the same language would require to be used, which God spake with them,—the same means of representation would need to be employed, which God himself had sanctioned,—the sensible, the visible, external."*

If the learned author had merely said, that there was a propriety or fitness in employing the same outward means of representation, as they fell in with the prevailing cast of thought in those among whom they were instituted, and so were likely to reach the end in view, we would have entirely concurred in his conclusion. But that such persons were so riveted to that style of thinking, as to render a symbolical worship in any proper sense necessary, could scarcely be admitted, without, at the same time, implying that it must have been perpetual,—that it could not be supplanted by another and more spiritual one, unless that "peculiarly religious mode of viewing things" had ceased to distinguish them. Besides, it may be a question, whether this mode of viewing things in nature was not rather the result of the symbolical religion under which the Orientals were placed, than that, previously existing of itself, it required to be met by a religion made up of symbolical institutions. At all events, the real necessity

* Baehr's Symbolik, B. 1, p. 24.

for the carnality and outwardness, which distinguished the worship of God in the earlier dispensations, was of a different kind, and arose from the very nature of those earlier religions, as preparatory for the better things, and the spiritual service of the gospel. It is too much the habit of the writer just quoted, though far ahead of most of his countrymen in zeal for the divine authority, and insight into the spiritual meaning of the Old Testament institutions, to view these, not as typical, but simply as symbolical, as parts of a worship complete in itself, at least so far complete, that the mind of the worshipper might have rested in it, without being necessarily carried forward to something higher and better than it provided.

But even allowing the exceptions now made to the sentiments expressed above, there can be no doubt that the mode of contemplation and insight there ascribed to the inhabitants of the east, has remarkably distinguished them, and that it must have qualified them in a singular manner for the intelligent use of symbolical worship. The converse, which they held with God through means of their religious services, though carried on by outward and fleshly signs, was yet perfectly adapted to their views and feelings; they still spoke to God, and he to them, in a language far from being unintelligible, because it was, in a manner, their natural and proper tongue. Nor was this all; for being confined to such a mode of communication with Heaven, they would naturally become much more expert in the use of it, than if it had been one merely of a variety of modes. *We* are so much accustomed to oral and written discourse, as the means through which we receive our knowledge of divine truth, and give expression to the feelings it awakens in our bosom, that we have some difficulty in conceiving how any definite ideas could either be imparted or expressed, where that was little, if at all, employed as the medium of communication. But this is to judge by a false standard; it is to go to the interpretation of another language with the help merely of our mother-tongue. And when we endeavour to apprehend how much was learned by pious worshippers of the mind and purposes of God, and how much they put forth of faith and love toward him, when the one was revealed through symbolical institutions, and the other exercised by means of symbolical services, we must carefully remember, that those who had to do with them, were fitted and prepared for an intelligent and profitable use of them by natural bent of mind and acquired habit, derived from the constant use of such means, as their only channel of religious communication with Heaven.

4. When the symbolical institutions and services have been explained in the way now mentioned, the next step is to take up the typical matter contained in the historical transactions, which fell out in the respective dispensations. In doing this, care must first of all be taken to view them in their proper place and connexion, as subsidiary to the idea symbolized in the existing religion. And as in reading the typical symbols, so in reading the typical transactions connected with them, we must make the views and impres-

sions they were fitted to convey to those whom they immediately respected, concerning the character or purposes of God, the ground and measure of that higher bearing, which they carried to the events of the gospel. Here, also, of course, must be taken into account the religious tendency and habit of mind, which has been noticed as a general characteristic of the inhabitants of the east; for they would doubtless be disposed to do with the acts of providence, as with the works of creation—contemplate them as manifestations of the Godhead, and discern in them the truths and principles of the spiritual world. Besides, it is to be borne in mind, that the historical transactions now in question were all *special* acts of providence. While they formed part of current events and arrangements, they were, at the same time, so peculiarly connected with the high purposes and immediate interposition of God, that the persons among whom they occurred could scarcely overlook either the hand of God in them, or their intimate connexion with his plans and purposes of grace. In the recorded transactions of Old Testament history, God is every where seen; the operations, which respect his own people, especially bear the mark and impress of his hand; these always seem to occupy a higher and more immediate connexion with him, than the ordinary and common events of providence, which concerned the world at large; and being the operations of a God, whose great object from the period of the fall was the foiling of the tempter, and the bringing in for his people of a redemption from the guilt and ruin of sin, they could not fail to be regarded by intelligent and pious minds as standing in a peculiar relation to this one centrepoint of the world's history. In proportion as God's people had faith to "wait for the consolation of Israel," they would also have discernment to read, with a view to the better things to come, the discoveries of his mind and character, which shone from his acts and dispensations toward his church.

It is in this view of the matter that we are to seek the main reason of God's frequent appearance on the stage of patriarchal history, and his manifested personal agency in the leading affairs of the church down to a comparatively late period. These could not otherwise have accomplished the ends for which they were designed. For they were all intended to carry a religious aspect, and were, indeed, so many parts of the revelation which God was making of himself as the God of grace. It was, therefore, of essential moment to the end he had in view, that his people should be able, without hesitation, to refer them to his special interposition; that they should not merely consider them as his, in the sense in which it may be said generally, that "God is in history;" but his also, in the more definite and peculiar sense of their being discoveries of his character in the relation he held to an elect seed, as the God of peace and salvation. But this could only be attained by his appearing ever and anon personally, or by means of special messengers, upon the scene: thus putting an easily recognised distinction between the acts of providence, in which his church was imme-

diately concerned, and those which respected the world at large. And when, in process of time, the church came to be less dependent upon these special acts of providence,—when the purposes and character of God were almost as fully disclosed as they could be by such imperfect means, and these were in a great measure supplanted by oral and written discourse, (as came to be the case during the time of the kings,) the necessity for God's personal appearance began to cease. It was enough, *then*, that the typical transactions, which still remained to be accomplished, should be indicated in the prophetic record, which thenceforth became the great interpreter of God's purposes of grace. So that taking into account all the peculiarities belonging to the typical facts of Old Testament history,—the close connexion they held with a typical-symbolical worship,—the farther connexion in which they stood with the special providence of God, as directing an economy of grace for the good of his faithful people,—and the clear announcements made concerning some of them in the word of prophecy,—they may well seem to have had enough to distinguish them even to the apprehension of an Old Testament worshipper, from the other events of providence, and to have been capable of affording him much insight into the character and purposes of a redeeming God.

5. We have only to premise farther, that in handling the historical types, regard must be had, not merely to the relation which they bore to the existing religion, but also to the relation which they often held to each other. For not rarely the fundamental idea or doctrine, which appears in one divinely-appointed act or institution, substantially re-appears in some future one; the Lord here, as in other departments of revelation, giving "line upon line, and precept upon precept." To discuss these separately, and in the historical order in which they occur, would lead to endless repetitions, and produce besides a broken and confused impression of the whole system of instruction to which they belonged. The plan most accordant with the principles already established, and most conducive to a regular and consecutive view of the truth, is to treat them according to the leading doctrines or ideas they respectively embodied, and to range those, which were alike in this respect, under their common root and principle. Such, as will be seen, is the plan we have adopted.

CHAPTER I.

THE TRUTHS SYMBOLIZED AND TYPIFIED IN THE PATRIARCHAL RELIGION, COMPREHENDING SUCH ALSO AS WERE EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE FALL.

SECTION FIRST.

THE TRUTHS EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE FALL, BEING THOSE ON WHICH THE FIRST SYMBOLICAL RELIGION WAS BASED.

THE religion of man, as man now exists, must be viewed as taking its commencement at the fall. What knowledge Adam possessed of the character and ways of God, before he fell; with what forms of worship he approached him, or in what manner he gave expression to the pious thoughts and feelings which animated his bosom, it is not possible for us, in the altered circumstances in which we stand, properly to conceive, neither does it concern us to know. Our fellowship with his condition, and our interest in the religious views and worship he maintained, begin only with the new aspect and constitution of things, which arose with the entrance of sin. It was only then also, that symbol and type found an occasion for their appearance, and a ground whereon to stand. For as they necessarily bear respect to a higher and better state of things preparing to be revealed, they obviously imply that the condition of man then existing was not in itself properly good and satisfactory, but partook in some respect of imperfections or evils, which needed to be removed. It was, undoubtedly, the opinion of many of the Fathers, which from them has found its way into the speculations of some modern divines, that "paradise was to Adam a type of heaven; and that the never-ending life of happiness promised to our first parents, if they had continued obedient and grown up to perfection under that economy wherein they were placed, should not have been continued in the earthly paradise, but only have commenced there, and been perpetuated in a higher state."* We need scarcely say, however, that this opinion has no foundation in Scripture, nor would it probably ever have been broached in the form here presented, but for the corrupting leaven of the Gentile

* See this proposition illustrated by Bishop Bull. His proofs from the earliest of the Fathers, quoted by him, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenæus, are very general. The first explicit proof is from Theophilus of Antioch, who speaks of Adam being "at length canonized or consecrated, and ascending into heaven," if he had gone on to perfection. The testimony becomes more full, as the influence of the Greek philosophy gains more strength in the church: and Clement of Alexandria expressly says in his liturgy, that "if Adam had kept the commandments, he would have received immortality as the reward of his obedience."

philosophy, which regarded all matter as essentially evil. It hence came to be imagined by those who had imbibed such views of matter, that so long as Adam was clothed upon with a body formed from the dust of the ground, and dependent upon its productions for support and comfort, his condition could not be one of full and proper blessedness; and that whatever he then enjoyed of good, could be no more than the shadow and foretaste of the higher felicity which awaited him in a more elevated and ethereal state of being.

Into this region of speculation we have no desire to enter, more especially as our present subject does not call us to do so. It was from a different tendency altogether, from a disposition to seek types of gospel things every where without rule or system, that most writers of what is called the Cocceian school were led to regard as typical many things belonging to the original state and constitution of man,—such as the manner of his creation, the formation of Eve from his side while he was asleep, his relation to the trees in the midst of the garden, &c. A distinguished writer of that school, however, has justly remarked, that "in the state of innocence there were no typical rites, adumbrating Christ and his merits, whereof there was then neither knowledge nor need; as the very word *creation* imports, which has nothing to do with a restoration or a restorer. All typical ceremonies are subsequent to the fall and the promise of grace in Christ."* Nothing, therefore, belonging to the garden of Eden, could possess a symbolical or typical character, till, in consequence of the fall, it had ceased to be the dwelling-place of man; till then, all was in a condition of unmingled good and blessed satisfaction, without any necessity in man's condition for the benefits of redemption, and consequently without any distinct or covert reference to these in the dispensation under which he was placed.

But while an opportunity was first afforded by the fall for the employment of symbols and types in matters of religion, it is not to be supposed that mankind were entirely indebted to these, under the dispensation immediately subsequent to the fall, for all their knowledge of religious truth. It was from the first a characteristic of the true religion, that its primary elements or fundamental ideas grew out of, and were based in certain well-known and important facts of history; and it was only for the purpose of embodying these ideas in a permanent form, and giving expression to others nearly connected with them, that institutions of a symbolical and typical nature found a place in the earlier dispensations. Therefore, in representing to ourselves the essential ideas of that religion,

* Altingi Opera, tom. V. p. 327. This is said by Alting in reference to the Sabbath, and is applied by him to the purpose of proving the Sabbath, which he regards as typical of the final rest of God's people, to have been instituted after the fall; so that the events connected with the fall must have taken place on the day Adam was made. This is altogether improbable. The proper conclusion is rather, that the Sabbath, in its original institution, was an ultimate and not a typical ordinance, having respect simply to man's present state, as is implied also in its having been admitted to a place in the decalogue.

which immediately succeeded to the fall, we must first of all endeavour to extract those which the circumstances connected with that memorable event were fitted to bring out and impress upon the minds of our first parents and their nearest offspring; after which, it will be time for us to inquire how far these or any other ideas were embodied in objects or transactions of a symbolical nature.

1. What is obviously entitled to rank first in this description, is the *doctrine of human guilt and depravity.*

From the period of the fall man knew that he no longer seemed to the eye of Heaven "very good," and continued to be the object of divine complacence. His conscience had now become defiled with sin, and the calm of his once peaceful bosom was in consequence disturbed by the tormenting fears of judgment. Nor did these prove to be groundless alarms; they were the forerunners of a curse, which blighted his natural condition, and banished him from Eden, as a place too hallowed and blissful for one who had proved unfaithful to his Creator, and joined hands with the adversary. The loss by our first parents of so much pure delight, and the unhappy change which had passed over their condition, must have indelibly impressed upon their minds the conviction of their sinfulness before God. And as their family grew, and one generation rose after another, there stood perpetually before them the barred gates of Eden and the flaming sword of vengeance, to force on them the melancholy truth, that they were by nature a corrupt seed, "the degenerate plants of a strange vine."

Evidences of the most appalling kind were not long wanting to show, what might indeed have been understood of itself, that sin in the first pair was evil in the fountain-head, which was never to cease sending forth its bitter waters over the wide field of humanity. The first-born of fallen man was emphatically a child of Satan, proud, self-willed, an obstinate rebel against Heaven, and of so inhuman a disposition, that he did not abstain from shedding even a brother's blood. That death should at all have entered a world so lately replenished by the hand of God with life and beauty, was a sad and affecting token of the evil which sin had wrought in the condition of man; but that the first victim of death should have fallen by the cruel infliction of a brother's hand, told how deeply the root and principle of sin had become implanted in the nature of man. And constantly as the well-spring of life flowed on, it bore upon its bosom the ever-swelling tide of human depravity. The more clearly to show what human nature now was, when left to give free scope to its native propensities, the first administration of God was characterized by the utmost mildness and forbearance, as well as by the richest displays of beneficence in temporal things. On this account Cain, though so atrocious an offender, was encompassed with the special protection of Heaven, and Lamech boastfully reckoned on a like protection after having slain the young man who injured him,* and deeds of violence proceeded till they

* There can be little doubt, that this is what Lamech meant to express in the speech he addressed to his wives, as constituting an important difference between

filled the whole earth. For the same reason, and in perfect accordance with this plan of extraordinary kindness on the part of Heaven, the lives of that first race of the earth's inhabitants were prolonged to a term, which for a period placed them almost beyond the fear of death. Above all other ages of the world's history, it was the one in which mercy and goodness most signally pervaded the providence of God, and man's earthly inheritance approached nearest to the rich dowry of temporal good originally possessed in Eden. But when the result of so much kindly and generous treatment only appeared in the more rapid and fearless march of corruption,—when it served but to nourish a race of heaven-daring transgressors, who constantly trenched upon, till they almost extinguished, the church of God, and whose giant deeds of wickedness and crime have obtained for them a name of undying infamy in the annals both of sacred and of profane story, it was impossible for any one, who had an eye for the discernment of truth, to doubt the doctrine of human guilt and depravity; the conviction of this, which was originally produced by the circumstances of the fall, must, in every serious and intelligent mind, have continually gathered strength and intensity from the disastrous course of events that followed.

2. Another doctrine, which the facts of primeval history rendered it equally impossible for any reflecting mind to gainsay or overlook, was *the holy character of God*, as one who loves righteousness and hates sin.

For that mankind should have been expelled from their happy abode, and made subject to a curse, which doomed them to sorrow and trouble, disease and death, in consequence of their having violated a single command of God, was a manifestation of the righteousness of God sufficient to impress the most careless heart. There was in it, as has been well said somewhere by Irving, "a most sublime act of holiness. God, after making Adam a creature for an image and likeness of himself, did resolve him into vile dust through viler corruption, when once he had sinned; proving that one act of sin was, in God's sight, of far more account than a whole world teeming with beautiful and blessed life, which he would rather send headlong into death, than suffer one sin of his creature to go unpunished. And though creation's teeming fountain might flow on ever so long, still the flowing waters of created life must ever empty themselves into the gulf of death. This is a most sublime exaltation of the moral above the material, showing that all material beauty and blessedness of life is but, as it were, the clothing of one good thought, which, if it became evil, straightway all de-

his case and Cain's, and entitling him much more confidently to expect the forbearance of Heaven. His words should be rendered, with Lowth, Kennicott, Herder, &c. "I have killed a man who wounded me, a young man that gave me a stroke; if Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and seven fold." If Cain, who, without provocation, in the wantonness of ungoverned passion, had killed his own brother, was yet protected with a threatening of sevenfold vengeance against the man who should lay violent hands on him, how much more Lamech, who had but retaliated on an aggressor, and killed him who gave the first stroke?

parts like the shadow of a dream." Appearing, as God did, at the very commencement of the world, by such "fearful things in righteousness," his worshipping people must have been deeply impressed with the truth, that he is a sin-hating God, of purer eyes than to behold iniquity; and as it was not a solitary or a transient demonstration which God gave of his severe holiness, but one ever present, and ever increasing with the growing signs of disorder and ruin, though sometimes, as in the judgment of the flood, reaching a greater height than at other times, the truth of God's righteous character could never lose its hold of the views and convictions of those, who lived during the first period of the church's history.

3. But if they had known nothing more of God than what was taught in these manifestations of righteousness, they would only have been appalled and terrified,—driven to the fearful conclusion, that it was impossible for them to stand before such a holy Lord God. To have trusted in him at all, and approached him with any acts of worship, it was necessary that he should have been known by them also as a God of grace; *salvation by grace* must have been recognised as a doctrine of divine truth, and a purpose of Heaven. That every thing was not brought down to instant and overwhelming destruction, was itself an indication of this. The mere respite of the sentence of death, and the constituting of an order of things, which was still replete with tokens of divine goodness, discovered a feature of mercy in the divine character, even toward the fallen creature. But as no vague intimations, or even strong conclusions of reason, from the general course of providence, could be sufficient to re-assure the heart on such a matter as this, an express word of promise was given, that "the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent,"—which, however dimly understood, could not but light up the conviction in the sinner's heart, that a recovery from evil was purposed by God. The serpent was the malicious instrument and occasion of the fall,—the visible and living incarnation of that evil power, which caused the loss of Eden and all its riches; and that this power should not only be withstood, but bruised in the very head, the seat of all life and agency, by the offspring of her, whom he had so cunningly deceived, clearly bespoke the intention of God to counterwork the malice of the tempter, and secure the final good of the fallen.

And that this, if done at all, must have been entirely of grace, the result of divine power and goodness, operating in behalf of the undeserved and guilty, could scarcely fail to impress itself upon the mind of every intelligent worshipper. For as all natural good had been forfeited by the fall, and death, the utter destruction of life and blessing, had become the common doom of humanity, whatever inheritance, or opportunity even, of good might be again possessed, could be the fruit only of divine beneficence, freely providing what never could have been acquired on the score of merit. And as the recovery itself implied a victory over the might and malice of the tempter, to be won by the seed of her who had been

first deceived, how otherwise could this be achieved, than by some peculiar manifestation of divine strength, graciously put forth in behalf, and by means, of the woman's offspring? Manhood in her and Adam, with every advantage on its side, had proved unable to stand before the arch-deceiver, so as to persevere in keeping the easiest possible command, and retaining possession of what was already conferred; how much more unable, then, must it have appeared to have prevailed, under every disadvantage, over the same powerful adversary, to the overthrow of his dominion, and the retrieving of that ruin which he had introduced, excepting through the grace and interposition of Heaven? These convictions could not but take hold of the minds of men from the first; and when they saw, as the history of the world proceeded, how the evil continued to spread, filling the earth with disorder and ruin, the impression must have grown continually more deep and settled in every piòus mind, that the restoration of man's fallen state, which was presented to the eye of hope in the first promise, must owe its accomplishment to the merciful goodness and almighty power of God,—in short, that *salvation by grace* was henceforth to be looked for at his hand, by all his sincere people.

4. Thus far the earliest inhabitants of the world might readily go, in learning the truth of God from the palpable facts of their history; and with the light afforded by these, they might yet take one step more, concerning the bringing in of that salvation or recovery, which was now the object of their desire and expectation. Adam saw—and it must have been one of the most painful reflections which forced itself upon his mind, and one, too, which subsequent events came, not to relieve, but only to deepen and imbitter the more—he saw how his fall carried in its bosom the fall of human kind, the whole of his posterity standing accursed in him, and deriving through his guilt a nature stricken with pollution and death. In the first constitution of things, therefore, there was manifestly involved, as connected with the work of evil, *a principle of headship*, in consequence of which the condition of the entire race was determined by that of its common parent; and the thought would naturally suggest itself to him, even without any express revelation from Heaven, that the same constitution might have place in regard to the work of recovery. We may even go farther and affirm, that the whole circumstances of the case, when duly considered, must have seemed to exclude the possibility of salvation on the ground of any other arrangement. For since Adam and all his posterity were together, and for his one act of disobedience, banished from the region of bliss, and made subject to the law of sin and death, how could an effectual deliverance, which should really open up the way to eternal life, be so much as conceived possible, otherwise than through a second head expressly constituted, and with divine power fitted for the undertaking? When the government, under which God placed his rational offspring upon earth, was such as to render it a righteous thing for him to cause results so fearfully momentous to grow out of one act

of transgression, the undoing of these results, and the bringing in of life and immortality to a perishing race, could only be imagined as the fruit of some proportionate work of righteousness, as pleasing to the eye of God, as the other had been hateful and offensive. But such a work could not be done by each man separately, and for himself; with powers so enfeebled and broken by sin, he was manifestly incapable of doing what was needed, to redeem either a brother's soul or his own; nor was any thing proposed for him to do, which, if performed, could have seemed entitled to the glory of so large a recompense. And the most natural, we might almost say, the inevitable conclusion in such a case was, that as all had fallen in one, so all, as many as should rise, should also rise in one—that as a depraved nature and a ruined inheritance had been brought into the world by the guilt of him who was constituted the first head of humanity, so a nature redeemed and an inheritance restored should in like manner be brought in by another head—of the woman's seed, yet not of her common offspring, one divinely appointed and qualified for the purpose.

This, possibly, is the utmost length that Adam and his immediate descendants could have gone in their views concerning the promised deliverance, so far as they might be left to gather these from the circumstances already referred to. They *might* certainly have learned all that we have ascribed to them; with serious thought, and the ordinary help of divine grace, they could scarcely have learned less; but the full understanding of this doctrine of headship, and the close agreement it was to establish between the fall and redemption, as to the descending curse of the one, and the rich provision once for all of the other, can be rightly perceived only by us, who are privileged to look from the end of the world to its beginnings, and are able to connect the first movements of the divine plan with its final accomplishment. Even the Jewish Rabbins, who were far from occupying our vantage-ground, could yet discern so well the reality of some connexion between the history of the fall and that of redemption, that one of them remarks, "The secret of Adam is the secret of the Messiah;" and another, "As the first man was the one that sinned, so shall the Messiah be the one to do sin away."* Ignorant and prejudiced as they were regarding the real work and character of Messiah, they yet were forced to entertain the conviction of a general correspondence between him as the second head and restorer of humanity, and Adam the first head and occasion of its downfall. With a clearer light to guide us than they possessed, we know that Adam was in this respect "the figure or type of him that was to come;" in this respect, however, alone; for in all other respects we have to speak, not of resemblances, but of differences between them. The point of agreement stands in the circumstance, that in the relation held by the one to a fallen, by the other to a redeemed offspring, the doctrine of headship was alike sanctioned and acted on

* See the quotations in Tholuck on Rom. v. 12.

by God; the natural seed of Adam were dealt with as one with himself, first in transgression, and then in death, the wages of transgression; and, in like manner, the spiritual seed of Christ are dealt with as one with him, first in the glorious righteousness which he brought in, and then in the eternal life, which is its appointed recompense from the Father. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Wherefore die in the one case? Because the sin of Adam, through which death entered, was, in God's reckoning, the sin of humanity. And wherefore, in the other, made alive? Because Christ's righteousness, or perfect obedience unto death, on account of which he could not be holden by the cords of death, but was by the right hand of God exalted to the highest place of honour and glory, is, in God's reckoning, the righteousness of all his people. Hence, in the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, we find along with the facts which attest in both cases the doctrine of headship, the parallel extended so as to include also the respective grounds or causes of the facts: "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so, by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous."

It is not our intention, and would lead us far, indeed, beside our purpose, to commend this doctrine of headship to the acceptance of men, by adducing such analogies of nature or grounds of reason as might be brought in support of it. We shall only say, that when viewed in the light now presented, though, like every peculiar doctrine of the gospel, a stone of stumbling to the natural man, it is yet full of comfort to the humble and childlike believer. To him it is a ground of comfort, even when considered with reference to its darkest aspect, the inheritance of evil, which in consequence of it has descended from Adam to the whole family of man; for while it presents us with abasing views of human nature, as in root and branch utterly corrupt and fallen, it keeps us possessed, at the same time, of right views concerning the rectitude and goodness of God. That the leprosy of a sore disease exists in our natural condition, is matter of sad experience; we can no more doubt it, than we can doubt our own existence; but how much more dismal would have been the thoughts it awakened, and how unspeakably more pregnant with fear and anxiety for the future, if it could have been traced to the workmanship of God, and had appeared as an original and inherent element in the constitution of things, primarily set up by him? It was surely a relief to the oppressed bosom of the prodigal, and was all that remained to keep him from the blackness of despair, that it was not his father who placed him in the vile condition of a swine-herd—that "these husks and that wretchedness were not emblems of his father." And much more should it be a relief now to the pious mind, when reflecting on the grievous disorders within and around us, to know that these have no higher origin than the first head of humanity, and that the sunk

and blighted condition we now occupy, is not the one which our heavenly Father assigned us, and which was all replenished with life and blessing.

But the principle in question is capable of administering a much higher consolation, when viewed in connexion with the second Adam, as it then appears in a manner the ground-floor of redemption, or the foundation-principle on which the whole scheme of grace was reared. For excepting in connexion with this principle, it is impossible to conceive how a plan of reconciliation, adequate to the wants of the human family, could have been introduced at all. If God had been pleased to deal with men separately, without respect to any general system capable of reaching to all, then, as no individual could have redeemed his own soul, so neither, and much less, could he have redeemed that of a brother; no place could have been found for the entrance of salvation, in consistence with the moral attributes of God; and either divine justice must have foregone its claims, or each transgressor must have irrecoverably perished under the weight of his own iniquity. But the constitution under which man was ushered into being, having been founded on the principle which admits, of many being represented and transacted for in one, a door was thereby provided for the entrance of salvation on the largest scale, and when a work was accomplished of sufficient value, it admitted of application to countless individuals. Unless we could have assured ourselves of an absolute and continued freedom from sin—and who could have done so, after the example of Adam?—we may well reconcile ourselves to the principle of government, which for one man's transgression made us all partakers of a fallen nature, since we find in that the only conceivable channel through which, when once fallen, we could participate in the benefits of a redeemed one.

He must know nothing aright either of sin or of redemption, who does not derive comfort from this line of reflection; and yet there is a comfort beyond that connected with the subject—arising from the prospect of that better condition which is now the sure portion of the redeemed. For the second Adam, with which by this principle of headship they are identified in condition and destiny, being incomparably greater than the first, it lays the foundation for them, not only of a recovery from ruin, but also of an inheritance of glory far surpassing that of creation in its best estate. If in the first instance it appears as a depressing load, sinking humanity in one mass down to the very brink of hell; it appears, in the other, as a divine lever, raising it to an elevation far surpassing what it ever possessed before, or could ever otherwise have attained. As it is declared by the apostle: "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Wonderful thought! we shall bear the image of the eternal Son of God, possessing one nature, and therefore

also one standing, one life, one blessedness, one glory, with Him who is "the heir of all things!" It is here we see how the divine plan, which seemed at first to carry a frowning aspect toward man, is fraught in reality with the richest beneficence, and far more than provides for repairing the ruin of the fall. Let whoever will, then, cavil and dispute at the principle which binds men, as fallen members, to a fallen head, it shall be ours rather to rejoice in it, as that through which a way has been laid open for our natures into the sanctuary above, a fellowship secured for them with the highest beings in the universe, and a destiny prepared, which shall far exceed in glory what could have been enjoyed in an earthly paradise.

We could scarcely say less on the doctrine of headship, which was the first principle of grace typified, and was so from the necessity of the case—that principle constituting, as has been said, what may be called the ground-floor of redemption, and providing the only opportunity or inlet, through which a scheme of salvation could have been brought in. Unless, therefore, the circumstances of man's early history had been so ordered as to give him some idea of such a principle, no other type or symbol, illustrative of any different feature of redemption, could have afforded him even the most imperfect view of this work of God. Its being of such a primary and fundamental character, is also the reason why we have given it so early a place in our investigation; for the means employed to impress it on the minds of our first parents, being not only of a typical nature, but of that class of types which consist of facts in history, it should not properly have been taken up, till we had finished what we might otherwise have discovered to belong to the religion of fallen man. But it was so essentially interwoven with his religion, as a religion of hope, and with his views of God's character as a God of grace, that we could not have exhibited the one, without including some consideration of the other. And though, as a portion of typical matter, it has on this account been brought in before its proper place, yet as it will be unnecessary to handle the subject again, we shall, before quitting it, simply notice a few other typical illustrations of the same principle appearing in the subsequent history of the human family, and doubtless intended to re-enforce and strengthen its hold upon their mind.

From the very nature of things, the principle of headship could have no such other development as it had in Adam, until Christ, the second Adam, should come to lay the foundation of a redeemed church. But we find various successive exemplifications of it, of a very important character, and the more fitted to carry forward the thoughts of believers to the coming redemption, that the principle appeared in each case connected with a blessing. It appeared thus in the transaction entered into with Noah after the destruction of the old world by the flood, when, for the sake of all flesh, God formed his covenant with that righteous man—the head, in a sense, of a new world, pledging his word, that no second deluge

should again sweep the earth of its inhabitants, but that seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, should not cease while the earth remained. It appeared again, and still more distinctly as a source of blessing, to many for the sake of one, in the covenant which God made with his servant Abraham, promising to be a God, not only to him, but also "to his seed after him,"—nay, promising that "in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed;" and connecting the promise, which originated in free grace, and came first to Abraham simply as an undeserved gift, with the righteousness of faith, which so pre-eminently showed itself forth in him, and rose to its highest exercise, when he offered up his much-loved son of promise on the altar, for then the word came to him, "*Because thou hast done this thing*, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee," &c. And finally, when the purpose of God had been so far disclosed as to render it manifest, that not only a chosen seed, but a royal house in that seed, a throne and a kingdom, were required for its execution, then the principle of headship again appeared in the covenant made with David, as the head of that royal house, pledging to his seed, and for his sake, a perpetuity to the throne and kingdom then erected. How easy and natural must it have been for the people of God, after all this, to connect the fulfilment of the great work of redemption with the person of Messiah, and from him, as emphatically "the Messenger of the covenant," to look for the fulfilment of all promise—for a world saved and rescued from every curse, a seed of blessing to inherit it, and an everlasting kingdom of glory for their final destiny? And for us, who stand midway between a redemption provided and the full experience of its blessings, how should our faith assure itself of the ultimate accomplishment of all that is promised, by seeing how the purpose of God, confirmed in covenant with each of those successive heads, has stood firm and sure? From the knowledge of what has thus been done in regard even to covenants far less intimately connected with any worth and sufficiency on the part of him, with whom they were respectively made, than in that sealed with the blood of Christ, we are taught the undoubted certainty of those better things, which are yet to be revealed in him, for the children of the covenant.

It appears from the preceding inquiry, that the first inhabitants of this world, as fallen, must, apart altogether from the institution of any symbols or religious rites, have possessed at least four religious ideas or principles embodied in the transactions connected with the fall: 1. The doctrine of human guilt and depravity; 2. Of God's righteous, sin-hating character; 3. Of salvation by grace; 4. And of a principle of headship, not less necessary to the bringing in of a general scheme of salvation, than it had been operative to the production of that universal ruin, which sprung from the first sin. Now, in order to complete our view of the religion pe-

culiar to that first race of worshippers, and its connexion with the coming dispensation of the gospel, we must proceed to inquire how far the fundamental ideas just mentioned were represented in any symbols or instituted rites of worship, and whether by such means even other ideas may not have been superadded to those already acquired. The only appearances to be found of a symbolical kind in the inspired records of that early period, are the three following—those connected with the tree of life, with the cherubim and the flaming sword, and with the institution of sacrifice. To the consideration of which we now proceed, taking them in their order.

SECOND SECTION.

THE TREE OF LIFE.

The first notice we have of the tree of life refers to it as a part of the newly created world, in which respect it had an important end to serve connected with man's original condition, but had nothing mystical about it—neither symbolizing any higher truth, nor promising any future blessing. "Out of the ground," we are told, "made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." The special mention made of these two trees distinctly marks them off from all the other trees of the garden, as having purposes to serve peculiar to themselves; and as the interdict of Heaven was laid upon no tree in the garden but that of the knowledge of good and evil, we have no reason to doubt, that the tree of life, equally with the rest, was given for the food of man. Nay, we are plainly taught, that while, like others, it was given for man's food, there were singular benefits to be derived from eating of it, effects to be produced by its fruit on the human constitution, which the fruit of no other tree was capable of imparting. But this more conclusively appears from the next notice we have of it, which relates to the period when, from being an ordinance of nature, this tree passed into a symbol of grace. "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

I think it impossible to read this piece of sacred history, and give credit to what is written, without holding by these conclusions: that the tree of life was at the first designed to be partaken of by man—that the eating of it would have conveyed to him the power of an endless life—that after having sinned, as he could no longer be the possessor of such a power, so he was debarred from the means of conveying it, by being himself driven from the garden

of Eden, and finding all access cut off to its tree of life. Wherein that tree, in its own essential nature, or in its outward appearance, might differ from the other trees of the garden, we know not; but in its relation to man, and its vivifying effects upon his frame, it undoubtedly differed in this, that while *they* could contribute to his daily support, *it* alone could preserve in undecaying vigour a being to be supported; as the pre-eminence was given to it over others, of being made to occupy the centre of the garden, so it possessed the singular virtue of ministering to human life, in its fountain-head, of sustaining it in its root and principle, while the others could only feed, as it were, the shoots and branches; *they* might have kept nature alive for a time, as the fruits of the earth do still, but *it* only could secure the vital powers of nature from the in-roads of disease, and the approach of death.

All this unquestionably Adam knew, as it was implied in the very constitution of things in Eden; and if he had remained steadfast in his covenant with God, ever shunning the tree of knowledge, and partaking of the tree of life, he would have continued in the possession of life, incorruptible and blessed, as he received it from the hand of God. But preferring, as he did, to set at naught the appointment of Heaven by eating of that other tree of knowledge, he sold his noble birth-right of immortality, and with that also of the food of immortality, and became an heir of death. The tree of life, however, did not lose its life-sustaining virtue, because the other tree had put forth its deadly poison; it remained still what God had originally made it, as capable as ever of maintaining the principle of an undying life in man—if man only had been permitted to partake of it. But that could no longer be, since he had preferred the way of sin to the way of holiness, and chosen death rather than life; his right to the blessings of immortality had utterly perished.

But though all was lost with the loss of righteousness, which had been conferred in the first, the creation-grant of Heaven, it pleased God to permit hope to enter, by revealing a purpose of grace for the recovery of the fallen; and though, for the present, man was banished from the garden of Eden, and cherubim and a flaming sword kept the way to the tree of life, which he had once freely trodden, yet *there* the tree stood with its life-sustaining power untouched—intimating, that the privilege of feeding on it was only for a season withheld, not finally withdrawn; that those ministers of justice meanwhile defended the tree of life from the approach of man but only till a righteousness should be found, which might again open the way to its blessed provisions. For as an act of sin had blocked up the way, nothing, it was manifest, but a work of righteousness could again lay it open. And hence it became, as we shall see, a leading object in the dealings of God toward his church, to disclose the nature and conditions of that necessary work of righteousness, on which man's prospect of a restored immortality hung. The relation he now occupied to the tree of life, of itself could furnish no information regarding it; the whole that

could be gathered from that was, that the property of an immortal life was yet destined to be the inheritance of man, and that this could become his only by virtue of a work of righteousness hereafter to be revealed and made good in the person of some second head of mankind. In this one symbol, therefore, that is, in the tree of life, viewed in connexion with the position held in reference to it by the human family after the fall, there were continually presented to the reflective mind the ideas, 1, of man's guilt and depravity, on account of which he was excluded from the tree of life; 2, of God's righteous character, which testified its abhorrence of sin in thus excluding him; 3, of salvation by grace, in having the prospect set before him of a restoration to life; 4, of the principle of a new headship, as that through which alone this prospect could be realized, and the now barred way of life could be again opened up for a lost and dying race. All these ideas, which indeed were forced upon him by the other transactions connected with the fall, were now palpably and permanently embodied in this symbolical ordinance; which was pre-eminently fitted to keep alive in the heirs of salvation a just apprehension of its nature, as being a re-investment with the privileges of an undying life, and of a glorious work of righteousness, as the means by which it was to be procured.

It is obvious, however, that in these symbolical representations connected with the tree of life, two other doctrines were indicated with such plainness, that they must henceforth have formed part of the creed of God's believing people—viz. the hope of a future state of being, and of the resurrection of the dead. While the promise of a deliverance, and through that the prospect of immortality were brought distinctly into view, the new constitution of things clearly taught them, that this prospect was not immediately to be realized; that the purpose of God did not admit of the tree of life being approached during the present scene of existence; and that all was to be shut up in hope to a period of restitution, determined in the counsels of Heaven, to which soul and body must be alike kept by the power and faithfulness of God. This belief would naturally gather strength in the minds of all sincere worshippers, by the progress of events in the fallen world; especially by such facts as the untimely death of Abel, and the miraculous translation of Enoch, which seems to have been purposely designed to check the expectation, most natural in the circumstances of that period, of a speedy fulfilment of the divine plan, and an early return to the blessings of immortality. They saw, not only that death was in the first instance to be the common inheritance of man, but that even a lengthened existence, on this side of time, was no mark of divine favour; and the knowledge of this, coupled with the intimation, that the destroyer was yet to be destroyed, and a pathway opened to the lost, for possessing anew the region, and partaking of the food of immortality, must infallibly have produced the conviction, that death was not the destruction of being, either to soul or body, and that it too should one day

be swallowed up in victory. The later Jews, warped and blinded as they were by false views of the Messiah, were yet able to catch some glimpse of this portion of the truth concerning his redemption; for of the seven things, which they imagined Christ should show unto Israel, two were, the garden of Eden, and the tree of life;* and again, "There are also that say of the tree of life, that it was not created in vain, but the men of the resurrection shall eat thereof, and live for ever."† So much light still remained to men groping amid the obscurity of judicial blindness. The first race of worshippers were placed in happier circumstances for apprehending the truth; and they must have been children indeed in understanding the import of God's symbolical teaching and providential arrangements, if through these they could not descry the prospect of a better country beyond death and the grave, awaiting those who should be heirs of salvation. Indeed, if they believed any thing at all concerning a purpose of mercy, bringing recovery from the ruin of the fall, it seems impossible for them to have avoided coupling with that belief, the conviction of a future life, and the hope of a resurrection from the dead; for without these, no such purpose of mercy could have brought one ray of comfort to them.

Having said thus much upon what the tree of life, in its relation to men after the fall, was fitted to teach them symbolically of divine truth, let us glance for a moment to the explanation of the symbol, which *we* are privileged to read in the ample revelations of the gospel. "To him that overcometh," says Christ, "will I give to eat of the tree of life, that is in the midst of the paradise of God." And again, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city." The least we can gather from these intimations of coming bliss, viewing them even in their most general light, is, that every thing which was lost by Adam, shall be again recovered by Christ, for those who are interested in his redemption. The far distant ends of revelation here most beautifully meet, and the last insight we have into God's purposes toward his people, reflects the lovely image of that first inheritance of blessing, which came along with the newly created world. In both alike we perceive a paradise of delight, and the tree of life in the midst yielding its immortal fruit. It is the intermediate portion of the history alone, which is overspread with gloom, and chequered with evil to the family of God. *There*, indeed, we see every thing disordered, and out of course—the beautiful workmanship of God defaced—a world heaving with trouble, and marred on every hand with signs of corruption and ruin—a fierce and incessant warfare between the elements of good and evil, in which the better part is too often put to the worse—humanity in all its members smitten with the wound of a sore disease, beset with numberless ills and calamities, the sport while living of its own wayward-

* R. Elias ben Mosis, in Ainsworth on Pent.
† R. Menahem on Gen. iii., quoted there also.

ness and folly, and the prey, when dead, of its most vile and loathsome adversaries. How cheering to know, that this reign of darkness and confusion is not to be perpetual—that it occupies but the mid-region of time, and is to be succeeded, at the close of ages, by a restitution of all things to the blessedness of order and life! The tempter has prevailed long; but, thanks be to God, he is not to prevail for ever. There is yet to come forth from the world, over which he has usurped dominion, and the people whom he has so often carried captive at his will, new heavens and a new earth, wherein righteousness and peace shall dwell for ever,—another paradise with its tree of life,—and a ransomed people once more resplendent with the glorious image of the Creator, well prepared by his regenerating power for inhabiting its blessed mansions, and partaking of its celestial fruit. May the joyful prospect be in us as a deep well-spring of consolation and delight!

But this is not the whole, great though it be; for the antitype is always greater than the type; the things of grace far transcend, in height and excellence of being, the things of nature; and therefore, when we read of a new paradise, and a tree of life in the midst of it, yet to be eaten by the children of God, much more is to be understood, than the simple recovery of what has been lost through sin, or a restoration of the original state of things. It tells us of a sphere and condition of being similar in kind, but in the nature of the things to be enjoyed much more blessed and glorious, than what belonged to our first parents in Eden. The paradise there provided for the habitation of man, and the tree of life planted in the midst of it, to supply him with the food of immortality, were doubtless formed in wise adaptation to the nature of man—fitted to minister life and enjoyment to a being constituted as he was, when at first fashioned by the hand of God. But, upright and blessed as he then was, he was still "of the earth, earthy," with a body formed of the dust of the ground, which even in its best estate was but a tenement of clay, and necessarily imperfect in its tastes and powers and enjoyments, as compared with those who occupy the higher regions of existence.

Now, as every thing in the paradise that is lost was made in wise and fitting adaptation to the nature of him who was to dwell in it, so unquestionably will it be in regard to that paradise, which is to come. And as the second Adam, who with his spouse the church is to possess it, is not like the first, of the earth, earthy, but the Lord from heaven, even in his bodily framework spiritual and glorious, in his whole human nature crowned with an honour and a majesty, which the eye of man in its earthly state cannot so much as look on without amazement, that future paradise, with its tree of life, must be exceedingly more excellent and glorious, than what originally existed in the new-formed earth. A better order of things shall then be established, because a higher state of being shall have been introduced. There shall not be the laying anew of earth's first foundations, but the raising of these aloft into the sphere of things heavenly and divine—not nature revived merely,

but nature glorified—humanity, not as it was in Adam, but as it now is in Christ, the glorious and mighty Lord of heaven, and a paradise fit for those to dwell in, a tree of life fit for those to partake of, who have been made like to the Son of God.

But are such promises as those referred to, really to be understood as speaking of an actual participation of a certain tree, destined to appear and grow for ever in the final habitation of the redeemed? Undoubtedly not; the language, as transferred to that heavenly region, is assuredly figurative, and we are no more to think of a literal tree, such as that which once stood in the centre of Eden, than of a literal manna, or a literal white stone, or the being literally set up as a pillar in the temple of God, which are equally promised to the faithful. These are all alike figurative expressions, employed to indicate, by such things as are known on earth, the future blessedness of the righteous; for by such things only can we, in our present state, form any idea of what awaits the people of God hereafter. Yet, though all are figurative, they have not the less a definite and intelligible meaning; and when promise is made us, not only of a paradise for our abode, but also of a tree of life in it for our food, an assurance is plainly given of something being provided for our glorified natures, corresponding to what the tree of life offered to the earthly frame of Adam. For him the tree of life was designed to minister the food of immortality; to sustain the principle of life without corruption or decay; in all probability imparting also a sense of pleasure and refreshment beyond what the common trees of the garden were capable of affording. The spiritual and refined natures of those who have entered into glory, shall certainly not need such carnal nourishment; they shall be cast in a higher mould; but still they shall be material frameworks, however exalted and ethereal in their temperament; and why may they not be capable of enjoyment—why may they not even require support ministered from without by means suitable for the purpose? That this *might* be the case is not prevented by any conceivable impossibility in the nature of things; that it *shall* be so, is what the language of Scripture seems clearly to import; an immortal life is to be possessed, and supplies of nourishment for all its powers and faculties, its cravings of desire and capacities of enjoyment, shall be ever found within its reach. *There* all hunger shall be satisfied, and thirst for ever quenched; the inhabitant shall never say, "I am sick;" the flow of pure and blessed life in his nature, shall experience no ebb; the service, on which he waits, shall be performed without weariness and fatigue to his members; the freshness of perpetual youth, the strength and alacrity of angels, shall be his; for he has access to the very fountain of life, and enjoys the full inheritance of a son in his Father's house. Blessed, then, truly and beyond present conception, shall they be, "who do his commandments that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

SECTION THIRD.

THE CHERUBIM AND THE FLAMING SWORD.

The truths symbolized by Adam's exclusion from the tree of life, have not been considered with any reference to the particular means employed for securing his exclusion, or to any change made regarding the occupation of the garden, in which the tree was placed. It might easily be conceived, that the flaming sword had no separate symbolical meaning, apart simply from being employed as a weapon of defence to guard the way to the tree of life, from the unwarranted approach of fallen man. But this cannot be conceived regarding the cherubim, which are said to have been placed in the garden after man's expulsion, and seem to have been in some way connected with the flaming sword; for the latter would manifestly have been of itself sufficient to prevent all access to the now forbidden region, and the other must have been added, because necessary to complete the symbolical instruction, which the objects of paradise were designed to furnish to the first race of worshippers. And as these cherubim will occur in another stage of our investigations, as occupying an important place in the tabernacle worship, we shall here, once for all, enter into a full examination of the light, which is thrown by the scattered intimations of Scripture on the nature of these symbolical figures. In this we shall make free use of the materials provided by Baehr, whose skilful and elaborate treatment of this symbol surpasses every thing we have seen upon the subject.*

It was customary in discussions upon the cherubim, both in this country and on the continent, to spend much labour in considering the derivation of the word *cherub*, with the view of determining the precise form and object of the cherubim. This line of inquiry, however, is now abandoned, as one that can lead to no certain or profitable result. The real origin and import of that word, is still a matter of doubtful disputation; and it is from other means of information than the name, that we are to form our ideas concerning it. All are agreed in this, that the cherub denotes a compound, and consequently an unreal, living creature, made up of four parts, those, namely, of a man, an ox, a lion, and an eagle. How these component parts were united into one creature, and what parts of each respectively were visible in its appearance, is not particularly noticed in scripture, and has given rise to various representations, all fanciful, and some of them not a little disgusting. The truth seems to be, what Von Mayer was the first to advance, and Baehr concurs in, that the cherub was not fixed and uniform, but variable in its form; for thus only is it possible to reconcile the descriptions given of its appearance in different portions of Scripture. The cherubim seen by Ezekiel beneath the throne of God, are described as having each four faces and four wings, (chap. i. 6;) but those after-

* See Baehr's Symbolik, Vol. I. pp. 311—314, pp. 340—360, also Hengstenberg's Authentie, Vol. II. p. 643.

wards described by him, as represented on the walls of the temple, are affirmed to have had only two faces, (chap. xli. 18, 19.) In one place, (chap. x. 14,) we even read of the face of a cherub, as if it were properly but one; and in the directions given to Moses, for the construction of those which were to stand at each end of the ark of the covenant, it is expressly said, that their faces were to be made so as to look upon each other, and toward the mercy-seat, (Ex. xxv. 20,) which had been impossible if they each possessed four faces. There must have been some difference in the appearances presented by the cherubim of the ark, and those of the veil, the former being separate and independent figures, the latter woven as paintings into the curtain. That the predominating appearance was that of a man, seems to be implied by what is said in the fifth and sixth verses of the first chapter of Ezekiel; but the number of faces, of feet, of wings, and of hands, differed according to circumstances—the variation in each case, perhaps, being designed to adapt it more fitly to the leading object of the representation, to which it belonged,—and the several variations tending the more certainly to make it be regarded as an unreal being, and so to prevent its being abused to purposes of superstition.

But what were these artificial creatures designed to represent or signify? This is a more important question, than that which concerns their particular form and appearance, and will require longer investigation. The radical meaning of the word *cherub*, being involved in obscurity, can throw as little light upon this part of the inquiry as the other, and need not therefore receive any consideration. But there is another name, which is applied to them in Ezekiel, and from which something more definite, perhaps, may be learned. This name, which is a single word in the original, is rendered in our translation, *living creatures*, (Ez. i. 5, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22; x. 15, 17,) and might perhaps be better rendered *living ones*. The Septuagint always renders it by ζωα; and this also, it will be remembered, is the word which is used by John in the Revelation to denote the four beings which he saw so often standing around the throne, and which are described by him as having the appearance of the four creatures which entered into the composition of the cherub,—viz. man, ox, lion, and eagle, (Rev. iv. 6, 7, 8, 9; v. 6, 8, 11, 14; vi. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7; vii. 11; xiv. 3; xv. 7; xix. 4.) In several of the places referred to, these beings are represented as speaking, as worshipping God, as taking part with the angels of God in the judgments he was going to inflict on the enemies of his church; which alone is sufficient to show, that the name applied to them is very improperly translated *beasts*, in the English, and many other versions of the Scriptures; as is also evident from the term properly signifying and correctly rendered *beast*, (θηριον,) being throughout the Apocalypse distinctly used of the grand head of apostacy and rebellion, (chap. xi. 7; xiii. 1, &c.) There can be no doubt, both from the identity of name, and from the same number and kind of animal forms appearing in each case, that the living creatures in John are to be regarded as substantially one with

those in Ezekiel. The only thing which may seem to indicate a difference, is the circumstance of the animal forms being spoken of in the Apocalypse as if each of them were separate and apart from the rest, while in Ezekiel, and other books of the Old Testament, they are represented as combining all the forms into one. It would appear, however, that when John describes each as being like some one of the four creatures mentioned, he has in view only the predominating features of the countenance, as may be gathered from what is said of the third, that it "had *a face* as a man;" and they all possessed six wings a-piece, which of itself shows them to have been compound beings, as seen by John, as well as by Ezekiel. We may, therefore, regard the representation, which is given by both writers, as descriptive of the same kind of beings, and may equally draw from the representation of each, what is fitted to help out our idea concerning them.

Now, from the cherubim being called emphatically *the living ones*, it may be certainly concluded, that the notion of *life* must lie at the foundation of the idea, and that we must conceive of them as beings possessing, in a peculiar sense, the properties of life. This is confirmed by the description given of them both in Ezekiel and Revelation, as being exercised in continual motion, (Ez. i. 44; Rev. iv. 8, "and rest not day nor night;") for incessant motion, continual working or activity, is a manifestation of life, and where every thing is still and motionless there is death. This fundamental idea of life in its highest sense, which is symbolized in the cherub, must receive its more exact determination from the several parts of which the cherub was composed. These being all creatures, creatures too existing in this lower world, the kind of life they personified must be the created, as contra-distinguished from the creative, and that as connected with this lower region of existence; and the four living creatures themselves combining from the several departments of nature the most perfect forms of animated being, the life they together personified was life of the most complete and elevated kind—in the highest scale, as it were, of creaturely existence. They belong to those creatures of the visible world, which constitute the first in rank and importance of its three kingdoms—the kingdom of organic life; and in that kingdom again they belong to the highest class, to that which possesses warm blood, and with that the highest physical life; nay, in that highest class they are again the highest, so that an old Jewish proverb says: "Four are the highest in the world—the lion among wild beasts, the ox among tame cattle, the eagle among birds, man among all (creatures;) but God is supreme over all;" meaning, that in these four is concentrated the highest style of creature-life, but that God himself is still infinitely exalted even above that; for all creature-life springs out of him, he is the Lord of creation. But these four have their high place among the creatures of the visible world, by virtue of certain peculiarities and powers of life, through which they are at once distinguished from other creatures, and from one another; and since they are, on account of these properties, united with each

other, to compose the cherub, which, as a combination of the highest properties of creature-life, is the witness and manifestation of the divine life, they must also of necessity indicate, when viewed in reference to their individual properties, certain special outgoings of the life that is in God, or so many modifications of the divine life. The cherub, therefore, is not only a symbol, when viewed as a complex whole, but each of its component parts have also their symbolical meaning; and this must be separately investigated before we can obtain a clear and comprehensive view of the whole.

(1.) THE OX was, among all nations of the ancient world, regarded as the symbol of creative or productive power. That this was also familiarly known to the Israelites, there is good ground for believing. Their language bears some not improbable traces of it. For not only does the Hebrew name of father (אב) bear a very close affinity to the Egyptian *Apis*, the symbol of the producing Osiris, but the name of the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, which is also the first numeral, and which in a manner gives rise to the whole alphabetical and numeral series, is the name for an ox. And the connexion of this animal with husbandry, being that solely employed in remote antiquity for bringing into operation the productive powers of the earth, naturally led the Israelites, as well as all other nations, to use the ox as the proper emblem first of husbandry, which calls forth the prolific properties of the ground, and, then, of production or making generally. It is this, which accounts for the likeness of the ox being so often taken, both in ancient and modern times, as the form under which idolatrous nations have sought to worship God as Creator. The history of the golden calf in the wilderness, and of the two images set up by Jeroboam, furnish too plain a proof, that the Israelites were well acquainted with the import of that symbol: for it was the God whom Moses declared to them, the Creator of heaven and of earth, that they professed to worship by means of that image. And in explanation of its symbolical meaning, Abarbinel remarks: "Therefore Jeroboam chose the appearance of an ox from the chariot of the cherubim, because it is the sign of abundance of corn, and blessing of the nations."* As one, then, of the component elements of the cherub, the ox was the sign or representation of the productive and generating power of Godhead.

(2.) THE LION, sometimes called pre-eminently "the beast," has ever been regarded by men of all nations as the king of beasts. That it was so regarded by the ancient people of God, is evident from many notices of Scripture. He is there celebrated primarily for his fearful strength and resistless power, (Judges xiv. 18; Prov. xxx. 30; 2 Sam. i. 23; xvii. 10;) and then, for what was its natural consequence, as an object of terror, (Hos. xi. 10; Amos iii. 8; 1 Chron. xii. 8, &c.) On account of these properties, which are possessed by no other animals in the same degree, he is frequently employed as an emblem of the invincible power of God, and that

* Wemyss' Clavis Symbolica, Bib. Cabinet, Vol. XXVI. p. 333.

more especially as directed to the punishment, overthrow, and extirpation of the adversaries, (Isa. xxxi. 4; Jer. xxv. 37, 38; Hos. v. 14; xiii. 7, 8.) Amos compares the judgments of Heaven drawing near to their accomplishment, to the roaring of a lion for his prey, (ch. iii. 4, 8;) and these judgments themselves were sometimes literally executed by means of lions, (2 Kings xvii. 25, 26; 1 Chron. xiii. 24; xx. 35.) Power, therefore, as required both for ruling and for judgment, was considered the distinguishing peculiarity of the lion; and lions were hence placed both at the right and left of Solomon's throne, as symbols of kingly majesty, which unites the ruling and judging prerogatives. This also is what was doubtless signified by the lion in the cherub.

(3.) THE EAGLE is among birds what the lion is among quadrupeds—he is the king of birds; not, however, for his greatness, but on account of his flight and sight. The property peculiar to birds above other creatures, of being able to raise themselves aloft toward the heavens, and move freely in boundless space, gave them a very important place in the symbolical rites of the ancients. They were on that account considered as the messengers and tongues of the gods, whose will and purposes they brought from heaven to earth. Hence arose the auspices, and hence also the custom, extending even to the present time, of giving wings to whatsoever was represented as heavenly and divine—for example, to angels, as divine messengers. For this reason too it is, that the cherubim, wherever they are more than merely named, are described as having wings. Now, what is the property of birds at large, is possessed in the highest degree by the eagle; no bird has such a power of flight, (Jer. iv. 13; xlix. 22,) none can fly either so high or so far. The power of sight also belongs to the eagle, not only above all other birds, but above living creatures generally, insomuch that *eagle-sighted* has become quite proverbial. He perceives his prey from the loftiest elevation, where to human eye he is scarcely discernible; the ancients even believed, that he could descry small fish in the sea, and look unmoved upon the sun. That respect was had also to this peculiarity of the eagle in the cherub, appears from the express mention that is made both in Ezekiel and the Apocalypse, of its being full of eyes all round, (Ez. x. 12; Rev. iv. 6, 8.) His extraordinary power of wing, which enables him to move with the utmost freedom and speed through the most extended space, rendered the eagle, as no other bird could be, a symbol of that property of God, by which he is confined to no space, omnipresence; whilst the singular power of vision possessed by that king of birds, represented the all-seeing eye of God,—the symbol thus uniting an image of omnipresence with that of omniscience, as these are most commonly united in Scripture, in the descriptions there given of Jehovah.

(4.) MAN has his high position above all other creatures of the visible world, not in consequence of his animal powers, whether more immediately connected with body or with soul; for in these he is surpassed by many of the inferior creation, and in particular

by the ox in strength, by the lion in courage and formidableness, by the eagle in penetration and wideness of range. That which distinguishes him from all other beings in the animal creation, is the power of intelligence, the spirit which he alone possesses, and which, as being the light of Jehovah; (Prov. xx. 20,) renders him in a peculiar sense the image of God. This distinguishing property of man is what his place in the cherub, as related to the other component parts, was designed to bring out, and symbolized the intellectual power of God, his absolute spirituality. But as this, in reference to the creation, manifests itself as wise direction and arrangement, the position of man in the cherub must be regarded as pointing chiefly to the divine wisdom.

While thus, however, we have found in the four component parts of the cherub, references to the divine powers of life, it is still not by any means to be regarded as properly a symbol of divine attributes. Its essential character consists in its being a creature; it is the image of the creature in its highest stage, an ideal creature. The powers of life, which in the actual creation are distributed among the creatures of the first class, are collected and concentrated in it. All creation is a witness of the powers of life that are in God, and consequently the cherub, in which the highest powers of life appear as an individual property, by means of its four component parts, is a witness, in the highest sense, of the creative power, which belongs to the invisible God—of the majesty, (or power to rule and judge,) the omnipresence and omniscience, and finally the absolute wisdom of God. As such a witness, it serves for the glorification and honour of God, nay, it is the personified living praise of God himself; and on this account the object of the ceaseless activity of the four living creatures in the Apocalypse is made to consist in the perpetual praise and adoration of God: "They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those beasts (living creatures) give glory, and honour, and thanks to him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created."

The soundness of the foregoing interpretation of the cherub is fully confirmed by a consideration of the places where this symbolical creature is represented as appearing. These are just two—the garden of God, emphatically called Eden or Paradise, and the throne of God; but more commonly in the latter connexion, than the former. Their first recorded appearance, however, was in the former, being placed after man's expulsion from Eden toward the east in the garden, along with the flaming sword, to keep the way to the tree of life. Eden, the garden of God, is nothing else than a state of life, where every thing breathes life, and not only is death excluded, but creature-life displays itself in its complete ful-

ness, power, grace, and beauty. In its centre stands the tree of life; every thing about it is green and blooming; streams of water run through it, to keep it perpetually fresh and healthful; and it is stored with living creatures. It is hence called by the Rabbins, "the land of life;" and by Philo, the region of life, incorruption, and immortality.* It was specially provided for man, into whom God had breathed the breath of life, and made a living soul; and man's original appointment was to dress and keep this garden of life. But when by disobedience he became subject to death, the region of life was no longer a dwelling-place suited to his condition, and still less could he prevail to keep it; he was therefore driven out of the garden, and cherubim were put in his place to occupy and keep it. This sufficiently shows that the cherubim must have been such creatures as pre-eminently have life—creatures possessing life in its highest degree; the region of life is their dwelling-place; to keep the tree of life and the way to it, is their occupation. There is only another passage in which the cherub appears in connexion with Eden or the garden of God; and that is, in the highly figurative description, which is given by Ezekiel, of the king of Tyre, in ch. xxviii. of his writings, where that king is addressed as "the anointed cherub that covereth," and is spoken of as having had his dwelling "in Eden, the garden of God." It would be out of place here to make any remark upon the import of this prophecy, and to inquire whether it had its full accomplishment in the literal king of Tyre; we have to do at present only with the terms in which his state of natural beauty and perfection is described; and from the ascription to him there of all wisdom, power, fulness, might and glory, the conclusion is obvious, that the name *cherub* is applied to him, because he seemed to stand upon the highest ground of creature-life and enjoyment. He united in himself, like the cherub, every thing which this creation has of greatness and glory. His house was formed of the most precious stones of the earth, and such fulness of life, happiness, and glory belonged to him, that it could be compared only with what was enjoyed in Eden, the garden of the Lord. Or, as the representation may also be explained, and as the words *anointed* and *covereth* seem to indicate, the king of Tyrus, in his own and his people's estimation, held the same high and sacred place in the kingdom of God, that the cherubim did in the sanctuary, as well as in the garden of Eden.

The other and more common connexion, in which the cherub appears, is with the throne or peculiar dwelling-place of God. This connexion comes into view first in the construction of the holy of holies in the tabernacle, Moses being commanded to make a cherub at each end of the ark of the covenant, looking at each other and toward the mercy-seat. This was nothing else, as will appear more fully when we come to consider the tabernacle, than the throne, which God was to occupy in his immediate relation to the Jewish people as their divine king, and from which he was con-

* Philo de Opif. Mundi, and Eisenmenger's Entdecktes Judenthum II. 299, as quoted by Baehr.

tinually to give forth communications of his will and pleasure. "*There*," said he to Moses, "will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims, which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things, which I will give thee in commandment to the children of Israel," (Ex. xxv. 22.) He was hence called the God that dwelleth or sitteth between the cherubims, (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; Ps. lxxx. 1; xcix. 1, &c.) which seems to have been regarded as meaning the same thing with another expression also used, sitting upon the throne, (Ps. ix. 4; 1 Kings xxii. 19.) Sometimes also we read of Jehovah riding upon the cherubim, (Ps. xviii. 10,) indicating that he appeared in his glory, having removed his throne, as it were, down to the region of this visible sphere, that he might give a full manifestation of his power and majesty by the deliverance of his people and the overthrow of his enemies. The appearances of the cherubim in Ezekiel and Revelation are all in like manner connected with the throne, or immediate dwelling-place of Jehovah, as in the one we are told of "the glory of the Lord being above the cherubim," and in the other, "of their being in the midst of the throne, and round about it." Now the throne of God, with which in so many passages the cherubim are represented in close connexion, is the place, where God in the most perfect manner manifests his glory; and the cherubim, being, as we have seen, the representatives of the whole creation, exhibiting a complex and combined image of the most perfect manifestations of God in the natural world, they consequently are the living, fictitious witnesses of God's glory. Fictitious, (says Baehr,) for the use made of the cherub in all these places must be understood as figurative; and we are not to suppose, that a being composed of an ox, a lion, an eagle, and a man, appeared on such occasions as actually existing. The representation is only to be regarded as made with the view of conveying the idea, which was embodied in the symbol of the cherub, that through it, as a combination of the highest forms of creature-life, the glory of God, as seen in creation, was peculiarly displayed.

The substance of this explanation of the cherubim we have taken with little variation from Baehr, and the greater part of it might have been presented as a quotation from his work, had we not deemed it proper to depart in some instances from his arrangement, and both to omit occasionally, and to add to his matter. In the grounds and principles of his explanation we entirely concur, but not in the application which he makes of them, and which partly appears in the last paragraph. For here we conceive, the great defect discovers itself, which pervades his work, and which often prevents him from making the full and proper use of his materials. That the cherubim were ideal creatures, intended to represent the perfections of Godhead, as exhibited in the highest forms of animated being, and with more completeness than any creature then existing possessed them, is what we regard as conclusively made out, and clearly illustrated in the preceding statement. But that

they were ideal or fictitious witnesses of God, as Baehr makes them in the sense of having nothing exactly answering to them, images without prototypes in nature, either present or future, representatives of no particular part of creation, but of the whole of it, as the workmanship and manifestation of God—this we conceive to be in itself very improbable, and liable to insuperable objections. For, however such abstract and entirely fictitious symbols might find a place in the false religions of antiquity, where a wild and capricious imagination had full play, it would be quite unsuitable in the true religion, at any stage of its history, where all is based on solid and substantial realities. Its symbols would not have accorded with its nature, unless they had been of a concrete, and not merely of an abstract kind; they must embody ideas, which were not for ever to float, as it were, in wide space without a local habitation, or a living form, but which were to have their realization in true existences and actual facts. They must be at once typical of what is some time to be in the reality, and symbolical of what meanwhile is only in the idea. Such unquestionably was the character of the symbolical institutions of the Old Testament worship, in so far as these are explained to us in the New, and we have no reason to think, that the cherubim form an exception to the general rule; as, indeed, they could not do so, without forming an incongruity in a religion, where every thing besides pointed to the substantial, the real. Nothing but the disposition of Baehr, which was formerly noticed, and which betrays itself in him, after all, in a much less objectionable form than it does in most of his countrymen, to regard the symbolical institutions of the preparatory dispensations as complete in themselves, capable of yielding an adequate representation of the divine character or purposes, when viewed simply in themselves without respect to the better things to come, could have led him to overlook this, and to rest satisfied with an explanation of the symbol in this case, which made it a mere abstraction, a representation of qualities, which, excepting in the Godhead, were to have no concrete personal existence.

But there are other, and still weightier objections, to this view. For if the cherubim were representatives of all creation, ideal forms to image forth the perfections of Godhead, as displayed in created being at large, then they were a symbol of what belongs simply to the region of nature; in which respect also they must have stood entirely alone; for all the other symbols, whether in the patriarchal, or in the Levitical religions, had respect to God's work, and character, and purposes of grace. They belonged to a religion suited to the condition and wants, the feelings and hopes, of fallen man: and consequently they spoke of God, not in reference to the gifts and prophecies of creation, but in reference to the ends and objects of grace, to sin and redemption. If we view the cherubim as symbolical of truths in creation only, we cut them off from this properly religious province; they necessarily lose their adaptation to the circumstances of sinful men. And not only so, but if such had been their character and design, it had been almost impossi-

ble to prevent them from being abused to purposes of superstition, and converted into instruments of idolatry. For if altogether fictitious representations of the divine attributes displayed in the creation, types that were to have no real antitypes, how naturally, or we might rather say, infallibly would they come to be regarded as images of the Deity! A very thin, and, to common minds, imperceptible distinction must, in that case, have separated them from the nature-worship of the heathen. For it was as exhibiting representations of the supposed qualities of Deity, that they worshipped the objects and beings of created nature. And to make the representations more complete, they were in the habit of joining two or three animals into one image, and thus giving rise to those monster-forms of idol-worship, of which we read so much in heathen antiquity.* Even the sphinxes of Egypt, which are still thought by many of the learned to have resembled in nature, and even to have suggested the idea, of the cherubim of Moses, there is strong reason to believe, were not regarded as mere representations of qualities, but rather of persons, whether human or divine, who possessed these qualities.† And hence, if the cherubim were ideal representations of the Divine qualities manifested in all creation, they would, in the first instance, have differed from all other compound forms known in antiquity, while also, from the views uniformly entertained of such forms by the surrounding nations, they must have inevitably led, as by a direct road, to idolatry.

What, then, is the application we would make of the materials furnished by the preceding investigation? What do we hold to be the proper antitype to the cherubim? We answer without hesitation, redeemed and glorified manhood. They were *symbolical*, as has been said, of the highest properties of creature life, and of these as outgoings and manifestations of the divine life; but they were *typical* of redeemed and glorified manhood, or prophetically representative of it, as that, in which these properties were to be combined and exhibited. This opinion we rest on the following grounds: 1. The considerations just advanced in refutation of the opinion of Baehr, go to establish the conviction, that the idea symbolized in this, as well as in the other parts of the preparatory religions, were to be embodied and fully realized in something belonging to the ultimate dispensation of the gospel,—the symbol of the one being the shadow or imperfect representation of a better thing to come, and consequently to exist, in the other. 2. That this better thing to come, in the present case, this antitype to the cherubim, is redeemed and glorified manhood, appears from the

* For proofs regarding the Egyptians, see Spencer de Leg. B. III. Diss. V. s. 4; and regarding other nations, Baehr, B. i. 357, ss.

† Among others Hengstenberg, we regret to say, advocates the opinion of the cherubim having a connexion, both in nature and origin, with the sphinxes, (see his Egypt and the Books of Moses, in Bib. Cab. Number III., 2d Series.) It is the opinion of Wilkinson, however, one of the highest authorities on Egyptian antiquities, that the sphinxes were always types or representatives, not of abstract qualities, but of the king. See the quotation in the work just referred to, p. 155. If any countenance might be derived from this fact, it would be in support of the view we take, rather than of Hengstenberg's or Spencer's.

correspondence between the design of the cherubic emblems and the primary destination of man. The former were "a complex and combined image of the most perfect manifestations of God in creation." And of all the objects in creation, it is said of man alone, that he was made in the image of God, he alone being possessed of that spirit of intelligence, which allies him to the Godhead, and fits him for yielding some faint representation of the spiritual nature of Godhead. Hence, in the ideal representation of divine qualities exhibited by the cherubim, though there was a combination of four animal-forms, "the appearance of man was the preponderating one,"—implying, that it was he, whom the representation chiefly respected, that the spirit of man still formed the ground and basis of that image of Godhead, and that to this the others were but subsidiary and additional. Man, however, not as he now is—for then the human figure alone had been sufficient; but man raised to a new sphere of life and being, endowed with properties which he did not possess even in paradise—man as redeemed and glorified. 3. The same further appears from the place originally assigned to the cherubim, and the purpose for which they were appointed; it was man's original ground they occupied, and his office in connexion with the tree of life that they entered into. The tree of life still being allowed to stand, though the way to it was barred till a righteousness should be provided that might prevail to open the way to it, which sin had barred, was a sign, as we have seen, of a coming restoration; a ray of hope shone out from the gloom, which attended man's exclusion from his first blessed home, and the more so, as the tree of life not only stood, as if in reserve for its proper possessor, but was meanwhile committed in keeping to creatures, whose forms at once bespoke their alliance to man, and implied their superiority to him as at present constituted. It was thus seen that the region of life was not finally lost to man; he still manifestly had an interest in it; though his person was for the present debarred, his nature was represented in it, and not only represented, but combined with powers and manifestations of life, such as did not belong to it, even in its unfallen state. 4. The other places, in which the cherub is represented as appearing, such as in the most holy place, or in immediate connexion with the throne of God, comport best with the idea of its being an ideal representation of redeemed and glorified manhood. For what does this bespeak but the wonderful fact, brought out in the history of redemption, that man's nature is to be exalted to the dwelling-place of Godhead? In Christ it is taken, so to speak, into the very bosom of the Deity; and because it is so highly honoured in him, it shall attain to more than angelic glory in his members, be admitted to dwell, if we may venture so to express ourselves, nearest to the throne of God, and be fitted for giving forth the most wonderful manifestations of his glorious perfections. Hence, while the cherubim in the most holy place looked toward the mercy-seat, to intimate that it was of divine grace and through the blood of atonement that man could

find a place there at all, they yet stood so close to God, that he was said to dwell between them; they occupied the region of the most excellent glory. Hence also in Revelation they are represented as being in the nearest place to Godhead, as "in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne," and to them as highest in rank among the heavenly hosts, and perhaps also as being most immediately interested, is given the first honour of proclaiming the successive openings of the seven-sealed book, (ch. iv. 6.) And the action ascribed to them in ch. vii. is capable of receiving a full and consistent explanation, on no other supposition than the one here advocated. For there the cherubim, or the living ones, are represented as in company with the four and twenty elders, taking harps and vials, and singing to Christ the new song: "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made US unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth." This is the only passage of any moment, of which Baehr offers no explanation; and no wonder that he offers none, for his theory manifestly admits of none. Vitringa, (Obs. Sacr. Vol. I. p. 846.) after Cocceius, has endeavoured to explain the passage by supposing, that as the four and twenty elders represent the general body of believers, so the four living creatures represent the ministers and office-bearers of the church—a supposition which is quite arbitrary, and derives no countenance from what is elsewhere said of them, is indeed utterly irreconcilable with it. Others again have considered them as representative of the redeemed church, ascribing to them substantially the same office as that which belonged to the twenty-four elders, and making in fact a double representation of the church in the same vision, which were both needless and fitted to mislead. But let the elders, with their thrones, and white robes, and crowned heads, be regarded as representing the whole church, the *persons* of the redeemed, in their prospective dignity, as a royal priesthood, and what more likely or natural than that there should be coupled with that a representation of the *nature* of those persons, as redeemed and glorified also, —not only rescued from the dominion and oppression of evil, but raised also to the possession of faculties not originally its own,— made a higher and nobler image of Godhead, than it was in the freshness and beauty of its first creation? Something of this kind was evidently required to complete the portraiture of the final condition of the redeemed church. Her members might live and reign as a royal priesthood with Christ on earth, though no further change had taken place upon their natures, than what was needed for their deliverance from the bondage and evil of sin. But a higher destiny than that awaits them. They are to be made like the Son of God,—are to bear the image of the heavenly Adam, —and to shine forth as the witnesses of God, on the highest and completest scale of animated being.

The other views, which have from time to time been adopted re-

garding the cherubim, are all formed upon a partial view of the representations in Scripture, and can only be made to harmonize with a portion of these. That this must be the case with an opinion once very prevalent, which held them to be simply angelic natures, is obvious at first sight; for the component parts of the cherubic forms being all derived from this lower territory of nature, seems expressly designed to exclude the idea that they represented the beings or objects of another sphere.* The opinion of Michaelis, that they were a sort of "thunder-horses" of Jehovah, somewhat similar to the horses of Jupiter among the Greeks, has nothing to give it the slightest countenance in Scripture, unless it be the one passage in Ps. xviii. which, as we have seen, admits of being otherwise and more satisfactorily explained. The opinion of Herder, and several other Germans of more recent times, which regards the cherubim as originally feigned monsters, like the fabled dragons or griphins, which were supposed to guard certain precious treasures, hence represented first of all as appointed to keep and watch the closed gates of paradise, and afterwards placed by Moses in the sacred region which the people were forbidden to enter, but latterly changing their character and employed in a poetical manner as a creature of the imagination,—this opinion is of too arbitrary a character, and deals too capriciously with the word of God, to need any particular refutation. It proceeds upon a false view of *all* the representations given of the cherubim, which were not even in the garden of Eden simply set up as formidable monsters, placed there to fray sinful men from approaching it, (if that had been all, the flaming sword alone had been sufficient,) nor were they placed at the door of the innermost sanctuary, as objects of terror, to guard its unapproachable sanctity, as on that hypothesis they should have been, but formed a part of its interior furniture,—and while all the later notices of the cherubim confessedly represent them in a light quite different from the supposed original design, there is yet, when properly considered, a very close and intimate connexion between these later and the earlier accounts, so that it is scarcely possible to doubt that one and the same fundamental character belonged to all the representations. For the forms in John are evidently related to those in Ezekiel,—these again to the cherubim in the temple of Solomon, which were themselves but copies of the Mosaic cherubim in the most holy place. As for the opinion of Spencer, that the cherubim, like most other parts of the Mosaic institutions, drew their origin from Egypt, and were formed in imitation of those compound monster images with which the religion of that country abounded, there is something in it so gross and heathenish, that few now, we should think, will be disposed to embrace it. Such compositions, it is well known, were by no means peculiar to Egypt; they were common to all heathen antiquity, abounding more, how-

* It is with some astonishment that we see this view revived in Elliot's Horæ Apocalypticæ Introd., a work which generally displays a sound judgment, as well as extensive learning.

ever, in the east, than they did even in Egypt; and it is singular, that of all the compound monstrous forms, which earlier accounts have mentioned, and the more successful investigations of later times have brought to light from the remains of Egyptian idolatry, not one has any resemblance to the cherub,—the four creature-forms combined in it, seem never to have been so combined in Egypt, and the only thing approaching to it is to be found in India. It is therefore utterly gratuitous to assert that the cherubim were of Egyptian origin, since compound figures of that precise form did not exist in Egypt, and compound figures generally, were as much Indian, Persian, Chinese, Babylonian, or Grecian, as Egyptian. But a plain and important distinction exists between all the compound forms mixed up with the idolatry of these ancient countries, and the cherubim of Scripture; for in accordance with the whole character of heathen idolatry, which was the deification of nature, the former were immediate images and representations of Godhead itself, while the cherub is throughout represented as a creature, in palpable contradistinction to the Creator; and hence even in the most idolatrous periods of Israelitish history, it was never worshipped as an image of God. Combining in its different parts the highest forms and properties of life, as found in the visible world, it was a fit representation of what the intelligent head of this part of creation was to become when the work of God concerning him was perfected; and appearing as a creature, servant or minister of Jehovah, its active obedience and adoration was like the homage of all creation to its Maker. This creaturely character of the cherubim is also fatal to another opinion, the only other we shall mention, according to which they are viewed as symbols immediately of divine perfections, or personifications of Godhead attributes. Men of great name have adopted that view—Philo, Grotius, Bochart, Rosenmuller, De Wette,—but it is utterly at variance with the essential nature of the cherubim, as representative of creature-powers and creature-life; and, indeed, though there had been more uncertainty than there is, as to this being the real character of the cherubim, yet we do not see how they could have been regarded as symbols of divine perfections, or personifications of divine attributes, without standing in evident contradiction to the second commandment. It would surely have been the greatest incongruity to have forbidden, in the strongest terms and with the severest penalties the making of any likeness of God, and at the same time to have set up certain symbols or likenesses of his perfections in the very region of his presence. No image or palpable representation could be admitted of any thing but what immediately and properly belonged to the creature; man himself, as a thinking, spiritual, moral being was the only image of himself, which God intended to exist here below; and the nearest possible connexion the cherubim could have with him, was, that as symbolizing by an ideal combination the highest powers and properties of life, which man in his restored condition was destined to possess, they served as a prophetic witness of that divine glory,

which the new creation, and especially man the head of it, should yield to God.*

It only remains that we shortly sum up what has partly been indicated already, the place and bearing which the cherubim in Eden were intended to have in the early worship of God. In considering this, it must be borne in mind what the account in Scripture, as well as the reason of the thing, justifies us in doing, that the cherubim there were not like those in the hidden sanctuary of the temple, fixed and inanimate creatures, but like those in Ezekiel and Revelation, possessing the appearance of life in the highest state of activity, and surrounded with the brightest radiations of divine glory. It is also to be borne in mind, that though connected with the flaming sword to the extent of being, along with it, instituted guardians of the way to the tree of life, they were not *so* connected as to be visibly united with it, brandishing the sword, as has sometimes been supposed, in their hands, nor could the first worshippers have any reason to regard them as ministers of vengeance. They saw them, indeed, occupying a region which none but holy creatures could possess, and which must, as a testimony for the righteousness of Heaven, be kept free from the encroachments of sinful men. In this point of view, their occupation of Eden must have afforded a perpetual sign and witness of the absolute holiness of God, and that as connected with the everlasting life, of which the tree in the midst of the garden was the appropriate food. This life had become for the present a lost privilege and inheritance to man, because sin had entered and defiled his nature; and other instruments must take his place to keep up the testimony of God, which he was no longer fitted to maintain.

But while in this respect the cherubim in Eden served to keep up the remembrance of man's guilt, as opposed to the righteousness of God, the chief purpose of their appointment was evidently of a friendly nature—a sign and emblem of hope. They would not of themselves, perhaps, have been sufficient to awaken in the bosom of man the hope of immortality, yet, when that hope had been brought in by other means, as we have seen it was, they came to confirm and establish it. For why should the keeping of the tree of life have been committed to them? They were not its natural and proper guardians; neither was it planted to nourish the principle of an undying life in them; they were but temporary occupants of the region where it grew, and being ideal creatures, whatever they kept, must obviously have been kept for others, not for themselves. Their presence, therefore, around the tree of life, with visible manifestations of divine glory, bespoke a purpose of mercy toward the fallen. It told that the ground lost by the cunning of the tempter, was not finally abandoned to his power and

* I have not thought it necessary to give any account or refutation of the opinion of Parkhurst and the Hutchinsonian school, according to which the cherubim were, in the proper sense, "emblematical of the ever-blessed Trinity in covenant to redeem man;" for the idea is in itself so extravagant, so destitute of any just foundation in the nature of the symbol, and so flagrantly at variance with the purport of the second commandment, that any special consideration of it were needless.

malice, but was yet to be re-occupied by the beings for whom it was originally prepared; and that in the mean time, and as a sure pledge of the coming restoration, Heaven kept possession of it by means specially appointed for the purpose. Eden thus had the appearance of an abode, though for the present lost, yet reserved in safe and faithful keeping for its proper owners against the time when they should be provided with a righteousness qualifying them for a return to its pure and blessed privileges; and there was set before the family of man a standing pledge that the now forfeited condition of immortality would be restored.

It would not be difficult, we conceive, for the first race of worshippers, with the aptness they possessed for symbolical instruction, to go a step farther than this, and derive one lesson more from the appearance of the cherubim in Eden. While these could not fail to be regarded as witnesses for God's holiness, in opposition to man's sin, and signs of God's purpose to rescue from the power and malice of the tempter what had been lost; they would also very naturally suggest the thought that the fulfilment of that purpose would even more than recover what was lost. These ideal creatures, which were placed for a season in paradise in man's room, united in their compound structure powers and faculties super-additional to those which were now possessed by man, or had ever been his—combining with man's intelligence the capacity for productive labour and usefulness peculiar to the ox, the might and dominion of the lion, the winged speed and far-seeing penetration of the eagle. The garden of God, and the tree of life, as emblems of hope to the church, being now in the keeping of creatures, possessed of such a singular combination of qualities, was surely fitted to awaken the conviction, that a higher place and destiny was to be won for man in the new creation; and that when the lost inheritance should be recovered, and the restitution of all things should take place, the nature of man should be endowed with other gifts and faculties for the service of God, than it originally possessed. Eden was not only maintained in its primeval honour after the fall, but it seemed rather to have gained by that unhappy event; higher beings kept possession of its treasures, brighter manifestations of divine glory hung around its approach; clearly indicating to the eye of faith that the tempter should be more than foiled, and that what tended in the first instance to defeat the purpose, and deface the blessed workmanship of God, should be ultimately overruled in his providence, for ennobling and beautifying this territory of creation.

SECTION FOURTH.

THE PRIMITIVE MODE OF WORSHIP BY SACRIFICE.

The symbols, to which our attention has hitherto been directed, were simply ordinances of teaching. They spake, in language perfectly intelligible, of the righteous character of God, of the evil

of sin, of the moral and physical ruin it had brought upon the world, of a plan and purpose of recovery, and other collateral points; but they did nothing more. There were no rites of service connected with them, nor of themselves did they call men to do any thing in outward action, expressive of the knowledge of divine things they were the means of conveying. But religion must have its active services, as well as its teaching ordinances: the one furnish light and direction, only that the other may be intelligently performed; and a symbolical religion, if it could ever be said to exist, could certainly not have perpetuated itself, or kept alive the knowledge of divine truth in the world, without the regular recurrence of one or more symbolical actions, fitted to call forth religious ideas and feelings. Now, the only action of this kind, which makes its appearance in the first ages of the world, and the one which continued to hold, through all the after stages of symbolical worship, the paramount place, was the rite of sacrifice.

We are not told, it is true, of the institution of this rite in immediate connexion with the fall; and the silence of inspired history regarding it till Cain and Abel had reached the season of manhood, has left room for much disputation concerning the origin of sacrifice,—whether it was of divine appointment, or of human invention! And if the latter, to what circumstances in man's condition, or to what views and feelings naturally arising in his mind, might it owe its existence? In the investigation of these questions, a line of inquiry has not unfrequently been pursued, more becoming the character of philosophers, than that of Christian divines; the solution being sought for in certain abstract views of human nature, and the annals of a remote and semi-barbarous heathenism, as if Scripture were altogether silent upon the subject, till we come far down the stream of time. If we really take *it* for our guide, the properly debateable ground regarding the rise and original nature of sacrifice, narrows itself to a very limited period of time—that, namely, which stretches from the fall of Adam, to the time when Cain and Abel presented their offerings to God; for from that period, verging too on the very commencement of the world's history, we are expressly told, that sacrifice of one kind had a recognised and appointed place in the worship of God. Not only are these first-born of Adam's family presented to us as worshippers at an altar, but by some visible token of acceptance—in all probability by sending down fire from heaven to consume the offering—God gave clear and undoubted proof in the case of Abel, that the mode of worship employed by him was sanctioned and approved by Heaven. From that period, therefore, at least, sacrifice of a certain kind held a sure and well-ascertained place in the public worship of God; it bore full upon it the warrant and approbation of Heaven; and if there had been any room for doubt concerning it during the brief space, which intervened between the fall, and the time of Abel's accepted offering, it was then, and thenceforth determined beyond all dispute, to be a mode of worship, to which God set to the seal of his authority. We should

rather say, *the* mode of worship; for sacrifice, accompanied perhaps with some words of prayer, is the only stated act of worship, by which believers for many ages sought to pay religious homage to God. When the pious line of Adam's posterity by Seth—recovering from the terror inspired by Cain's treatment of Abel, and the ferocious spirit otherwise evinced by his seed—"began to call upon the name of the Lord," there can be no doubt, that they did so, like Abel, by presenting to him such a sacrifice as they knew he would accept—just as Abraham, of whom we so often read at a later period, that he first "built an altar," and then "called upon the name of the Lord." That sacrifice held the same place in the instituted worship of God after the deluge, which it had done before, we learn first of all from the case of Noah—the connecting link between the old and new worlds,—who no sooner left the ark, than he built an altar to the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings of every clean beast and fowl, from which the Lord is said to have smelled a sweet savour. And the conclusion is confirmed into absolute certainty by what we read in the history of Job, who was expressly commanded by God to offer burnt-offerings for his friends, as he had been wont regularly to do for his family,—and also in the history of the patriarchs by the chosen line of Abraham, who, as they all worshipped God with acceptance, and that exclusively by means of burnt-offerings, so they must have had for such a service the warrant of his authority, as sometimes, indeed, they had his manifested countenance and special command, (Gen. xv. 9, 10, 17; xxii. 2, 13; Job i. 5; xlii. 8.)

The very latest of these notices in sacred history, concerning the worship of God by sacrifice, carries us up to a period far beyond that, to which the authentic annals of any ancient kingdom reach, and shows it to have had a settled and authorized place in the worship of God, from within a few years subsequent to the fall. From the time of Abel, downwards through the whole period of antediluvian and patriarchal history—in other words, from the first recorded act of worship at all, till the introduction of the minutely prescribed ritual of the Mosaic dispensation—as all proper worship seems to have concentrated itself in a certain kind of sacrifice, so it was not offered at random, or by a sort of religious venture on the part of the worshippers, but with the well understood sanction, and virtual, if not express appointment of God. So far, therefore, as concerns the real character and proper place of sacrifice in patriarchal worship, the question of its first origin is one of comparatively little moment; for however originated, its acceptance by God is coeval with the earliest record of divine worship; and if with believers in revelation, it may be regarded as a proper subject of debate, whether mankind were ever left to the impulse of their own minds in the matter of sacrifice, without any warrant or direction from God, the result can only tell upon the state of things, which existed between the fall of Adam, and the offering of Abel, —it must have respect simply to the worship of the first pair themselves.

It is another question, however, and one of much greater importance for our present line of inquiry, why the sacrifice of burnt-offerings was accepted by God, and constituted the one great act of primeval and patriarchal worship,—a question, which depends for its solution, not so much upon the precise manner of its origin, as upon the grounds which might have led God to adopt it as the grand medium of communication between him and the earliest race of his sincere worshippers. We cannot pass on, however, to the consideration of this question, without remarking farther, in respect to the origin of sacrifice, that the facts already noticed concerning its first appearance and early history, carry along with them the refutation of all the theories, we may say, which have sought, on philosophical principles, to account for its *human* origin. The theory, for example, which has received the suffrage of many very learned men, both in this country and on the continent,* and which attempts to explain the rise of sacrifice, by a reference to the feelings of men, when they were in a sort of beastly and sensual roughness, incapable of entertaining any thing but the most gross and carnal ideas of God, and consequently disposed to seek the continuance of his favour, or the averting of his displeasure, by treating him, as the most likely means, after the manner of men, with a gift, more or less costly, according as the feelings that prompted it were more or less deep—this theory is utterly at variance with the early notices of acceptable sacrifice, found in the word of God. It is grounded upon a sense of the value of property, and of the effect naturally produced by gifts of property from one man to another, which could not possibly have been acquired at so early a period as that, at which Abel is recorded to have brought his offering to the Lord. And whether the gift were viewed in the light of a fine, a bribe, or a feast, (for each in different hands has its share in giving a particular mould to the theory,)no sacrifice offered in such a spirit could have met with the favour and acceptance of God; for it must then have sprung from a feeling essentially degrading and idolatrous, and the whole history of patriarchal worship, in which sacrifices appear so uniformly sanctioned, and at times so explicitly ordered by God, reclaims against the idea.

It has been more commonly sought, however, and especially within the last century, to account for the origin of sacrifice, by viewing it as a symbolical act, and such as might have naturally occurred to men in an early stage of society, from the feelings or practices, with which their situation as individuals or members of society made them familiar. But very different modes of explaining the symbol have been adopted by those who concur in holding this to have been the manner of its origination. To say nothing of the minor shades of opinion, which some have adopted by viewing the subject with too exclusive a reference to the Mosaic ritual, Sykes proposed to explain the rationale of sacrifice on the ground,

* Spencer de Legibus Heb. L. III. c. 3. So also substantially Priestly, H. Taylor, Michaelis, Rosenmuller, Meiner, &c.

that "eating and drinking together were the known ordinary symbols of friendship, and were the usual rites of engaging in covenants and leagues."* And on this ground certainly some plausible explanation might be given of sacrifice, as it appeared in the later ages of heathenism; but nothing even like a probable account can be rendered of the symbol, as exemplified in the offerings presented by God's sincere worshippers during the first ages of the world, commencing, as these did, at a time when no such symbol of friendship could have obtained a footing amongst men, and being all, even to the close of the patriarchal age, there is every reason to think, precisely of that class of sacrifices, in which no part was consumed by the worshippers—*holocausts.* Warburton laid the ground more deeply and with greater show of probability, when he sought to account for the origin of sacrifice, by a reference to the ancient mode of converse by action, in aid of words—this being, in his opinion, sufficient to show, how the common sentiments of our nature would draw the first men into this mode of worship, whether the sacrifice was eucharistical, propitiatory, or expiatory. Gratitude for good bestowed, he conceives, would lead the worshipper to present, by an expressive action, the first-fruits of agriculture or pasturage—the eucharistical offering; the desire of divine favour or protection in the business of life, would, in like manner, dispose him to dedicate a portion of what was to be sown or propagated—the propitiatory; and for sacrifices of an expiatory kind, the sense of sin would prompt him to take some chosen animal, precious to the repenting criminal who deprecated, or supposed to be obnoxious to the Deity who was to be appeased, and slay it at the altar, in an action, which in all languages, when translated into words, speaks to this purpose: "I confess my transgressions at thy footstool, O my God; and with the deepest contrition implore thy pardon, confessing that I deserve the death which I inflict on this animal."† If for the infliction of death, which Warburton here regards as the chief feature in the action of expiatory sacrifice, we substitute the pouring out of the blood, or simply the giving away of the life of the victim to God, there is no material difference between his account of the origin of the latter kind of sacrifices, and that recently adopted by Bachr. This able and learned writer rejects the idea of sacrifice having taken its beginning in the supernatural teaching and formal appointment of God, because implying, that man needed instruction from without to teach him, either that he was to sacrifice, or how he was to do so. He maintains, that "as the idea of God, and its necessary expression, was not something that came upon humanity from without, nothing taught it, but something immediate, an original fact; so also is sacrifice, the form of that expression. From the point of view in which *we* are accustomed to contemplate things, separating the divine from the natural, the spiritual from the corporeal,

* Sykes' Essay on Sacrifice. See also for a fuller refutation, Magee on the Atonement, note 49; and Richie on Piacular Sacrifices.

† Warburton's Div. Legation, B. VII. ch. ii.

this form must always carry a strange appearance; but if we throw ourselves back upon that mode of contemplation which views the divine and spiritual as inseparable from the natural and corporeal, we shall find nothing so much out of the way, in the fact of man's feeling himself constrained to represent the internal act of the giving up of his whole life and being to the Godhead—and in that all religion lives and moves—through the outward giving away of an animal, perhaps, which he loved as himself, or on which he himself lived, and which stood in the closest connexion with his own existence."* Something like this (though stated in a form decidedly more objectionable) appears also to be the view of Tholuck, who in his dissertation on sacrifices appended to his Commentary on the Hebrews, says, "that an offering was originally a gift to the Deity—a gift by which man strives to make up the deficiency of the always imperfect surrender of himself to God." And in regard to burnt-offerings in particular, he says, "Both objects, that of thanksgiving and of propitiation, were connected with them; on the one hand, gratitude required man to surrender what was external as well as internal, to God; and, on the other hand, the surrender of an outward good was considered as a substitution, a propitiation for that which was still deficient in the internal surrender."†

It is not our purpose to discuss at length these different modes of accounting for the first adoption of sacrifice, which are alike in principle, and differ merely in the particular form that is given to it; we shall only say, that they equally lie open to three objections, which seem, in our opinion, quite conclusive against them. 1. First, the analogy of God's principles of action and method of procedure toward his church in later times, is opposed to the views in question. Certainly at no other era of the church's history did God leave his people to their own inventions, for the discovery of a suitable way of approaching him, and giving expression to their religious feelings. He has always asserted to himself the prerogative of prescribing the ordinances, as well as teaching the truths, connected with his worship and service. How solemnly in Old Testament times did he express his jealousy and dislike of any inventions, which his people might seek to introduce, as destructive of the simplicity which it was his object to maintain! And even in the New Testament dispensation, which stands pre-eminent for the spirituality of its nature, and its comparative independence of outward forms, the ordinances through which the church was to present acceptable service to God, were settled by divine authority, and "will-worship" is expressly denounced. But if even the New Testament church, with all her advantages of a completed revelation, a son-like freedom, and an unction so plentiful of the Holy Spirit, that it is said "to teach us all things," was not left by God to choose her modes of worship, how much less must that liberty have been allowed to men in the very infancy of a fallen condition, and with nothing to guide them but the faint glimmer-

* Baehr's Symbolik, B. II. p. 272.
† Biblical Cabinet, vol. XXXIX. p. 252.

ings of a newly-commenced revelation? With the few elementary ideas they then possessed of God's character and purposes, and the little experience they necessarily had of divine fellowship, were *they* really in a condition for devising of themselves proper ordinances of worship? Where, then, should have been the jealousy of God, so often manifested at other times, in reference to the purity of his ordinances? And where, we may also ask, his compassion for the creatures he had made, in the now sadly altered circumstances of their lot? Is it to be imagined, that while he had just revealed himself in mercy to the parents of the human race, and awakened in their broken hearts the hope of recovery, he should, at the same time, have set them adrift upon the wide world, without giving them so much as one ordinance, in which they might count on meeting with his presence and blessing? It is repugnant to all our ideas of God's tenderness to the guilty and penitent, to suppose that he should have left them thus dreary and desolate, to grope their way self-taught to the proper means of maintaining fellowship with him, as it would also have betokened little regard for the purity of his own worship. Was his express interference, indeed, not needed for these purposes? Had fallen man light enough of his own, to give him sure direction in the matter, without detriment either to his own comfort or to God's glory? Alas! how unlike that, was the preposterous attempt to hide himself from the presence of an omniscient Jehovah among the trees of the garden—betraying at the very outset a darkness and perversity of mind, from which no enlightened views of God's character or service could be expected? And that it was no momentary failing, this impotence in human nature to conceive and act aright of itself concerning the things of God, is too evident from the fearful degeneracy and corruption, which presently began to display itself in the eldest and most numerous branch of Adam's posterity. 2. But, secondly, the theories now before us are met by an unresolved, and, on their hypothesis, unresolvable difficulty. regarding early sacrifice. For as burnt-offerings, or that kind of sacrifices, which consisted in the blood of slain beasts, was not only the most ancient mode, but *the only* recorded mode of sacrificial worship among God's sincere people down to the giving of the law, by what light of nature, or what suggestions of reason, could the first worshippers have supposed such offerings to be peculiarly acceptable to God? Let the symbolical action be viewed in either of the shades of meaning formerly described—as expressive of the offerer's deserved death, or of the surrender of his life to God, or as a propitiatory substitution to compensate for the defeat of such surrender, whichever it might be, how could he ever imagine, that devoting to death a creature of God would be a proper and acceptable mode of expressing the idea? Death, as reigning over the inferior creation, is so familiar to us, and so intimately connected in many respects with our daily comfort, that it might seem a light thing to put an animal to death for any purpose, either common or sacred; but it was otherwise with the heads of the

human family. They must have shrunk from inflicting death on the very lowest of the animal creation, knowing that these had become subject to death only through their sin. They knew, indeed, that the whole irrational creation was made in a sense for them; they were lords over it—but not at first to the extent of being at liberty to take away the life of animals for their necessary support; the grant of flesh for that purpose, was not given till after the deluge; and that they should yet have thought it proper and becoming to shed the blood of animals merely to express a religious idea, nay, should have regarded that as so emphatically the way of honouring and serving God, that for a long period it might almost be said to be the sum and substance of their worship, is utterly incredible on any supposition apart from the immediate direction and explicit warrant of God. 3. But finally, not only do those theories respecting the human origination of sacrifice, run counter to the analogy of God's character and dealings, and leave unresolved a difficulty, concerning the earliest kind of sacrifices, which seems to give the lie to their pretensions, they are also confronted by a fact, with which they never can be fairly reconciled,—the fact of Abel's accepted offering from the flock, in undisguised preference to that of Cain, from the produce of the field, (Gen. iv. 4, comp. with Heb. xi. 4.) The offerings of the two brothers differed, we are told, not only in the outward oblation, the one being a living creature, while the other was an inanimate production, but also in the principle which moved the brothers respectively to present them. That principle in Abel was faith—consequently not this, but something else in Cain,—and as it was faith which both rendered Abel's sacrifice in itself more excellent than Cain's, and drew down upon it the approving testimony of Heaven, the faith meant could obviously not be a mere general belief in the being of God, or his readiness to accept an offering at the hands of man; for faith, in that sense, must have been possessed by him who offered amiss, as well as by him who offered with acceptance. The faith of Abel must have been of a much more particular and definite nature, for it had respect, not to any general views of God's character, or sentiments of devotion toward him, but to a certain determinate mode of worship. It must, therefore, have had a special revelation or testimony of God regarding sacrifice to rest upon, pointing out that kind of sacrifice which God would accept, as contradistinguished from what he would not; and to learn what the kind of sacrifice prescribed actually was, we have only to look to the offering presented by Abel. For this we are plainly warranted and bound to regard as expressing the mind of God. So that the difference between Abel's sacrifice and that of Cain, in regard to the things offered, must be looked upon as essential, not accidentally arising from his occupation as a shepherd, but necessarily growing out of his faith as a true worshipper of God. Cain, in short, is presented to our view as without grace and faith—a child of nature, following only nature's teaching in the kind of service he yielded to God; his oblation is an undoubted

specimen of what man could do in his fallen state to originate proper ideas of God, and give fitting expression to these in outward acts of worship; but unhappily for our theorists, it stands condemned on the inspired record as a presumptuous act of will-worship, which God would not accept. Abel, on the other hand, appears as a child of grace, and because a child of grace, therefore a man of faith, implicitly following the direction of God's word—first, no doubt, as to the ground of his hope and confidence, and then, as to the more excellent way, in which he was to show forth the better principles he had imbibed.

Upon the whole, therefore, we can see no possibility of fairly avoiding the conclusion, that the institution of sacrifice must have been of divine origin; for though the fact is not explicitly recorded in Scripture, yet the notices there found regarding ancient sacrifice, are such as to present insuperable objections against any theory, which can be framed to account for its human origin. It is proper also to add, that this conclusion is strengthened, not only by the mention made of the skins, with which God clothed our first parents, which are most naturally viewed as skins of slain victims, but also by various other notices connected with primitive worship, which seem clearly to imply the existence of a revelation from God, directing men to all things necessary concerning the way of serving him. Thus the expression, rendered in our Bible, "in process of time," but literally "at the end of days," which is used to denote the occasion of the offerings of Cain and Abel being presented, is undoubtedly to be understood of some fixed and stated period, which, it appears, they agreed, for some obvious reason, in considering as the proper time for bringing their gifts. Its being said also of the exile of Cain, that he "went out from the presence of the Lord," is a distinct intimation that there was a place where God revealed himself as near to those who sought him—a sanctuary, to which the manifestations of his presence were confined; and that, we can scarcely doubt, was connected with the eastern approach to the garden of Eden, where visible symbols of his glory were stationed. Then the distinction of beasts into clean and unclean, which comes out in the account of the deluge, as one already existing, and familiarly known to Noah, must of necessity be regarded as a sacrificial arrangement, all animals being then interdicted for food, and an arrangement it is impossible to trace to any other source than the immediate interference of God. From these various and scattered notices of primeval times, we cannot conceive divine worship to have been then in that floating and unsettled condition, in which it must have been, if every thing had been left to the freedom or caprice of each man's private inclination. They seem to be the not uncertain traces of a revelation, which rendered plain and obvious to the men of that dispensation the way in which they ought to wait upon God so as to be accepted by him. And though in the altered circumstances of the world, now, we are apt to regard it as absolutely essential to a revelation, that there be a written word, in which it may be preserved pure

and entire from the corruptions of men, yet in that age of protracted life, when the days of a man were literally as the days of a tree, the necessity of a written word was in a manner superseded; and a revelation limited, from the very nature of the case, to a few leading points, which had to exchange hands only twice during the whole period from Adam to Noah, could be in no danger of suffering much by the process of transition, which it had to undergo.

But while we think the divine origin of sacrifice capable of clear deduction from what is written concerning it in the word of God, and regard it as a portion of the truth well worth contending for, it is not, as formerly intimated, absolutely indispensable to a correct view being formed of the worship, which prevailed in patriarchal times. For though the precise time and manner of its origin are not recorded, we yet know, that from within a few years subsequent to the fall, the sacrifice of burnt-offerings was the great act of worship; that sacrifices of this kind were not offered at a venture, on the bare authority of man's own will or reason, but in faith on some word, which plainly involved, if it did not formally impose, the obligation of presenting them; and that when so presented, they were visibly owned and accepted by God, and so must have been designed by him to be regarded as an authorized and settled ordinance in his church. We know nothing of primitive sacrifice in the church of God, and are not at liberty to think of it, otherwise than as now described—as that religious solemnity, in which alone faith had its appropriate exercise, and God was acceptably worshipped. And the chief question regarding it in the present point of view is, what as so presented, on the one hand, and received on the other, did the act of sacrifice originally symbolize? What religious feelings did it necessarily express, or what principles of divine truth did it embody?

It would not be a legitimate mode of answering this question, to go to the law of Moses, and endeavour to ascertain from what is written there the radical idea or ground-principle of sacrifices by blood. For the revelation by Moses formed in many respects, and in none probably more than this, a great step in advance; and those, who lived under the dispensation he was honoured to introduce were certainly furnished with means for apprehending the exact import and ultimate design of sacrifice, which were not possessed by the earlier worshippers of God. In considering what sacrifice was to those who lived under the first dispensation of grace, we must view it in the light merely, which their own knowledge and circumstances were fitted to throw upon it—leaving the more full and accurate exhibition of its nature, as afterwards determined by the handwriting of Moses, to another part of our inquiry. (1.) Now, there can be no doubt, first of all, that when they found God approachable only through the sacrifice of a creature's life, they must have discerned in this an unequivocal testimony to the sinfulness of their condition. They well knew, that God was far from delighting in blood, and that death, either in man or beast, was no part of the constitution of things, as origi-

nally settled by him. It entered only in consequence of man's transgression, and on his account, (he being the head and lord of creation upon earth,) was made to spread its desolation through the whole field of animal existence. The thought of this was fitted, in any circumstances, to suggest painful and humiliating reflections in the minds of those, who, from the very nature of their position, would be ever ready to look back from the effect to the cause; but when death was thus brought into the service of God, and every act of worship carried in its bosom the life-blood of an innocent creature, what more striking memorial could they have had of their now sunk and fallen condition? With this perpetually before his eyes, no intelligent and believing worshipper could forget, that he stood upon the floor of a broken covenant, and had to deal with a God needing to be reconciled.

(2.) Then, secondly, their waiting upon God, with his own express sanction and encouragement, in a way, which so clearly bespoke their guilt and misery, was undoubted evidence of his gracious and merciful disposition toward sinners. In presenting such sacrifices, they came to him as sinners, expressing their faith, that for them there was "mercy with God that he might be feared, and plenteous redemption that he might be sought after." And having God's warrant for so coming, and the seal of his approval, when they did come, their faith was proved to be, not a false or presumptuous confidence, but a well-grounded and heavenly principle. Seeking and finding God thus, they eyed him as the repairer of the breach amid the very signs of its existence, and received from him, through an avenue of death, communications of life and blessing. That their relation to him had suffered a fearful and violent disturbance, this was the first thing, which must have forced itself on the convictions of those who found no way of access to God but through such sacrifices of blood; and with that must have been inseparably linked this other conviction, that so far from allowing the disturbance to grow into perpetual and hopeless alienation, it should certainly be rectified and restored for all who sought him in the appointed way.

(3.) But while this symbolical worship spake of a reconciled God, gracious to sinners, it spoke also of the way, through which reconciliation was to come; for the altar, on which it was presented, being ever stained with blood, a clear testimony was incessantly borne to the grand principle, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission" of sins. How far the earliest race of worshippers may have been able through this to descry the ultimate ground of a sinner's pardon, by connecting the blood of their sacrificed victims with that of the Lamb of God, cannot be pronounced on with certainty, and may have differed considerably according to the intelligence and faith of individual worshippers. But undoubtedly those who possessed any measure of these, understood that the devoting of an animal victim upon the altar, was the peculiar expression of faith, with which God was well pleased; and understanding that, it seems impossible for them to have avoided the

conviction, that the covenant of forgiveness and peace, which God was willing to make with his fallen offspring, was essentially connected with the life-blood of sacrifice. But the thought would inevitably occur, of what avail could the blood of such victims as they presented, be for the establishment of so important a covenant? What intelligible effect could it of itself have on the blotting out of transgression, or the providing of eternal life for the sinful and dying? Here manifestly they could find no satisfaction; and believing, as they had good reason to do on other grounds, that a redemption was to be brought in by God, which would be sufficient to undo all the misery and ruin of the fall—that this should of necessity be accomplished, not by each man for himself, but by some second head of humanity, and by him no otherwise than through some demonstration of righteousness worthy to form the ground of so great a recovery,—intelligent worshippers knowing and believing this, the farther conclusion must almost inevitably have forced itself upon them, that a suitable offering, embodying in itself an act of consummate righteousness, was to be included in the work of redemption; and that those offerings of irrational victims were but temporary expedients, necessary, meanwhile, as a fit expression of faith, and as means proper for keeping faith alive in the earth till the time should come for perfecting the work of God. Unquestionably, if they were not favoured with some more definite revelations, than are found extant now in the notices of primeval history, this anticipation of faith must have been enveloped in much darkness and mystery. But even from what is recorded, we can scarcely doubt that it was entertained, and that finding God gracious to them only through a medium of death, they must have concluded, that it would be peculiarly through death that the work of redemption was to be brought in.

(4.) For us, however, who can read the symbol by the clear light of the gospel, and from the high vantage-ground of a finished redemption can look back upon the temporary institutions which foreshadowed it, there is no darkness or uncertainty regarding the full and proper import of that great act of patriarchal worship. We see embodied in it the central truth of God's spiritual and everlasting kingdom—the truth of a dying Saviour as the only ground of peace and reconciliation between sinful men and their offended God. We see here, again, the ends of revelation most beautifully meeting together; and as amid the perfected glories of the Messiah's kingdom, all is represented as clustering around the Lamb that was slain, and doing homage to him for his matchless victory over sin and death, so the earliest worship of the church exhibits "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," as the one grand object of hope to the fallen, and the channel of restored communication between heaven and earth. At a later period, when the church was furnished with a fuller revelation and a more complicated worship, symbolical representations were given of other, and what might be called subordinate parts, of the work of redemption; but when that worship existed in its simplest form, and em-

bodied only the first elements of the truth, it was meet that *that* alone should be represented, which was to constitute the groundwork of the whole. And seeing how the members of the ancient church were thus called, in every act of religious service, to witness to the three great truths, of their own condition as sinners, of God's reconcileableness to them even in that condition, and of the shedding of blood as the appointed means of reconciliation, we may gather strength to our faith, in these first principles of the gospel, as coeval with the very planting of a church in this fallen world, and especially may have our convictions deepened of the peerless magnitude and value of that one foundation-truth—"Christ crucified, the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation."

CHAPTER II.

THE IDEAS AND PRINCIPLES DEVELOPED IN THE FACTS OF PATRIARCHAL HISTORY, OR THE TYPES EMBODIED IN THE TRANSACTIONS OF THAT SPECIAL PROVIDENCE, WHICH GOD EXERCISED TOWARD HIS CHURCH, FROM THE PERIOD OF THE FALL, TO THE EVENTS CONNECTED WITH THE DISPENSATION OF MOSES.

It has already been stated, that the types of history are not to be taken by themselves, but must be viewed in connexion with those which were grafted into the symbolical institutions of religious worship, and as only supplemental to them. While proceeding, therefore, to investigate the one, we must be careful to carry with us the remembrance of what had been previously taught in the other. Now, the patriarchal believers were made acquainted, as we have seen, and by the exercises of religion, had their minds perpetually impressed with the truths of their own guilt and sinfulness,—of God's righteous, sin-avenging character,—of his gracious purpose to redeem the fallen,—of the mediatorial nature of the promised salvation, as requiring the interposition of one able and willing to vindicate the injured holiness of God, and provide a ground of acceptance for sinful men,—of the consequent readiness of God to receive those who sought him in the appointed way, namely, by sacrifices of slain victims; and finally, of a complete, ultimate restoration, both of the personal dignity of man, and of the inheritance he had lost. These truths were of so elementary and fundamental a nature, that in a sinful world, no religion could have been established without them, which was to have the effect of restoring man to fellowship with God. Though they were not to be seen in their full magnitude and importance, till they were clearly developed in the events of gospel history, yet they formed indispensable elements in the very first foundation of an economy of grace. Such ideas, therefore, are presupposed, rather than di-

rectly taught, in the events of a typical providence; they were already interwoven with the religion which was set up and practised; and the truths for which we are to look, in the divinely arranged events of a preparatory scheme of providence, are of a subordinate and dependent nature, truths less essentially connected with the plan of redemption, than with the application of its principles and blessings to the hearts and consciences, the lives and destinies, of men. The more prominent and important of these, we shall now endeavour to extract from the portion of history at present under consideration, and to range in the order that seems most natural and appropriate.

SECTION I.

ELECTION BY GRACE.

The first that meets our observation, is one of the most repulsive in all ages to the natural man, but one most intimately connected with the progress of the divine plan,—the doctrine of *election by grace*, or the important fact, that the redeemed were to be, not mankind at large, but only an elect seed, chosen by God himself, and appointed to salvation. It was most natural, that men should at first have judged otherwise, and that knowing God was minded to turn again the captivity of sin, they should have expected him to leave none a prey to its dominion. This presumption affectingly discovers itself in the joyous announcement, which escaped from Eve at the birth of her first-born child, "I have gotten a man from the Lord;" never apparently doubting, that he whom she thus hailed as the gift, should also be a child, of God—one of that promised seed, which was to bruise the head of the serpent.* The promise seemed to make no distinction between one portion of her seed and another. It merely gave intimation of a general fact, and we cannot wonder, that the feelings of maternal affection should have led her to take it in a sense so wide as to comprehend all her offspring. Never was mother destined to receive a sorer disappointment; and when in progress of time she saw her second son, who had been named Abel, (emptiness,) in token probably of his inferior natural gifts or appearance, visited with peculiar marks of Divine favour and blessing, while her eldest son, rising in proud rebellion against Heaven, at once slew his righteous brother, and became the head of a malignant race of apostates, she then came to learn, in sorrow of heart, that it was not all her offspring, nor even perhaps that portion of it, which to man's eye might seem most likely to receive the honour, but an election according to grace, in whom the promise of redemption was to be made good.

* This, I think, is the utmost that can be gathered from Eve's exclamation regarding her views of redemption. The turn sometimes given to it, "I have gotten a man, the Jehovah," as if she looked upon this son as already the incarnate Redeemer, is scarcely allowable in a grammatical point of view, and besides, presupposes an amount of knowledge, which it did not consist with the divine plan to communicate so early. That Jehovah was to be himself the Redeemer, and as such was to be born as a babe into the world, was one of the latest announcements of prophecy.

A visible and open testimony for this truth was kept up through the whole of the antediluvian period, by the separation of the church from the world, which, as far as one can gather from the brief and scattered notices preserved of the period, seems to have been marked by different forms of worship, and manners widely dissimilar, rendering it necessary for the two sections of the human family to live in great measure apart from each other, and even to occupy distinct localities. So much at least seems to be implied in what is said of Cain, and the party who adhered to him, "going out from the presence of the Lord," building for themselves a city, becoming giants and men of renown by their deeds of proud daring and violence, and their daughters being regarded as simply "daughters of men," viewed in connexion with what is said on the other side, of Eve's having, at the birth of Seth, got another son in the room of martyred Abel, of the party to which he belonged, calling upon the name of the Lord, (that is, no doubt, according to the mode originally instituted by God,) of their separate genealogy, and their being familiarly known under the designation of "the sons of God." Such obvious and palpable distinctions manifestly bespeak the different and opposite parentages of the two classes of the human family,—that the one class only were related to God as their Father, and that consequently his people were to be an elect seed. The truth of God in this respect, no doubt, came to be obscured when the church began to fall from her steadfastness, and the sons of God married the daughters of men, as if there were no grounds of separation broad enough to keep the two parties any longer asunder. The waters of the deluge, however, soon came to pour confusion on these unprincipled alliances, and to inflict the judgment of Heaven on the unbelief out of which they sprung. And when all had perished but that one family which adhered to the cause of truth and righteousness amid universal defection, the most awful demonstration was given of the fact that God's people are an elect seed—a seed, indeed, so elect, that it was possible for them to be reduced to the smallest conceivable remnant, while still the cause of Heaven was with them, and all besides were children of perdition.

The history of the new world did not proceed far, till other symptoms of the same fact discovered themselves. That even in Noah's family there was an election, shone out but too prominently in the behaviour of Ham toward his father, on the sad occasion of his backsliding, who, like a true child of the wicked one, seemed to rejoice in the iniquity, and to glory in his father's shame. And we pass but a few generations to get to the time of Abraham, when this great truth was in some respects more fully brought out, than it had ever been before. The new series of divine manifestations, commencing in the person and family of Abraham, gave undeniable proof that the people of God are not only a distinct seed, but elect according to his own free and sovereign grace. This had been implied, rather than plainly taught, in the facts of antediluvian history; and though a pious and reflecting mind might easily

have gathered that it was God who made the one class to differ from the other, yet, so far as we know, there was nothing in that period of the world's history which broadly displayed the *grace* of election. But it obtained a very striking display in the line of providences which began with the call of Abraham. Of him it might be said, in a peculiar sense, that "the Lord did choose him," (Nehem. ix. 7,) singled out, as he was, from his father's house, though certainly not the oldest, apparently indeed the youngest of the family, and employed like the rest in "serving other gods," (Josh. xxiv. 2.) The change to the better in his condition, therefore, which passed over him, when he was honoured with the peculiar favour and blessing of Heaven, had its origin solely in the distinguishing grace of God. He stood forth a living monument and witness of the truth, that the "Lord has mercy on whom he will have mercy." The testimony was again renewed in the case of Isaac, who was preferred before Ishmael, as being in a sense quite peculiar the gift of God, in his very birth the offspring of singular and sovereign grace. And when it pleased God still farther to limit the seed, with which the word of promise was to be connected, by selecting only one of Isaac's sons, a still more remarkable confirmation was given to the same truth; for not only was the younger chosen before the elder, but the election was made and intimated before the children were born, and consequently "before they had done either good or evil," to give occasion to the preference. Nay, even within this narrow circle it appeared, in the course of time, that there was a circle narrower still—that they were "not all Israel, who were of Israel." Through every generation we discern the manifest traces of a believing and spiritual, as opposed to an unbelieving and carnal portion. And of the three grand distinctions which connected one tribe with the government, one family with the throne, and one individual with the person of Messiah, we find all bestowed in a way of sovereign grace, —the first being given to Judah, though neither the best nor the oldest in his father's house, the second to David when only a shepherd boy tending his father's flocks, and the last to the virgin Mary, "a handmaiden of low estate." (Ps. lxxviii. 68, 70; 1 Sam. xvi. 7—10; Luke i. 48.)

We have thus a long chain of providences, reaching almost from the commencement of the world, to the birth of him, in whose work and kingdom all previous exhibitions of divine truth were to receive their final form and development, all manifesting the real subjects of divine favour and blessing to be a chosen seed, and chosen, not on the ground of any qualities in themselves entitling them to the distinction, but in the exercise of free and sovereign grace on the part of God. In one respect, all such preceding manifestations of this principle, pointed to the man Christ Jesus, as the head of redeemed humanity, and in him it was made perfect. For in so far as the principle consisted in the exercise of a divine choice, electing to peculiar love, service and blessing, without respect to, or even in despite of any apparent grounds entitling to the choice,

in none might such a principle have been expected to find, and in none did it find, so grand and striking a manifestation, as in Christ. He was incomparably beyond all others, the chosen servant of God, "his elect in whom his soul delighted," the corner-stone, which was to be laid as a foundation for the glorious building of a redeemed church, and in which the whole was to be fitly framed together,—therefore, like no other, elect and precious, (Isa. xxviii. 16; xlii. 1; Ps. cxviii. 22; Eph. ii. 20; &c.) Nor did he become thus the object of the Father's choice after he appeared on earth, and had done things worthy of the Father's regard; he was so before time began, and is therefore said to have been "foreordained before the foundation of the world," and as the Lamb of God, whose blood alone can cleanse from sin, "slain from its foundation," (1 Pet. i. 20; Rev. xiii. 8.) Yet when he appeared, how far was he from seeming to the eye of man, the fit object of such a peculiar regard! How obscure in his parentage! How poor and unfurnished in his natural condition! How striking the contrast between the lowliness of his outward state, and the loftiness of his claims! And when he began to put forth the latter, how much was there still in the former to countenance the surmises of unbelief, "Whence got this man this wisdom? Is not this the carpenter's son?" That one so humble and despised, should yet have been the Son of the Highest, sole head of restored humanity, and by the Father's appointment heir of all things, what could so singularly manifest the height and sovereignty of election, as moving in a sphere far above man's wisdom, and pursuing a course which provokes only the scorn and opposition of a sinful world.

So far the doctrine of election was applicable to the man Christ Jesus, and found in him its highest exemplification. But as he was without sin, in his very conception separate from sinners, there must evidently be a limitation in the respect it bears to him. For the principle of an elect seed, chosen in every case without the reality, and often in the marked and manifest absence of the very appearance, of desert in the objects of choice, could obviously receive a complete and proper development only in the people of Christ. And this development in them, from the very nature of things, and the rise made in the divine plan at the establishment of Christ's kingdom, must necessarily be, not only of a personal kind, having respect to them as individuals, but to such also as heirs of salvation. The election, which we have traced through so long a chain of providences, had for its immediate and ostensible object, the appointment sometimes of individuals, and sometimes of whole families, to certain outward distinctions and privileges on earth, which did not in general, at least, of necessity infer, and carry along with them a personal interest in salvation. Israel as a people, were objects of electing grace, but only in regard to the outward standing and privileges of the covenant; in regard to the actual enjoyments of God's favour and blessing, "they were not all Israel, who were of Israel,"—there was an election within that

election. It is not this, however, which was not properly a matter of revelation, but kept among the hidden things of God, and in itself a final and ultimate thing, incapable of standing as a type or shadow of something better and higher,—it is not this secret election, which undoubtedly had place at all times, in the effectual operations of divine grace, but that other and outward one, which stands clearly and prominently forth in the transactions of Divine Providence, that is to be regarded as having a typical design, whose fulfilment is to be sought in the current affairs of Christ's church. The election, however, in the type being often comprehensive of a family or nation, and having respect to merely outward gifts and privileges, so far from proving that the same must also be the case in the antitype, proves exactly the reverse. For the type, as we before showed, is the development of a divine truth or principle, on the lower and earthly scale of things; so that now, when the antitype has come, the outward passes into the inward, the seen and temporal rises to the unseen and eternal.* The enjoyment of an earthly boon, or the possession of mere temporal advantages in a former age of the church, could not possibly represent and typify the calling of the church in another age, individually or collectively, to an endowment with boons or advantages of the same kind,—for that were to make a thing substantially the type of itself, and, by overlooking the progress in the divine plan, to cut off the very ground on which all types stand, and the purpose for which they were used. So that it is of necessity in the state and prospects of the hidden man of the heart, that we are to look now for corresponding manifestations of the principle of election. And just as the symbolical offerings of a carnal worship, which were the fit expressions of faith under the Old Testament, have their counterpart under the gospel in spiritual sacrifices of the heart, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ,—so the visible tokens of respect, the audible communications, the temporal deliverances, the worldly honours and distinctions, by which in former times God separated and sealed an elect people to himself, are in these latter times supplanted by the realities of the Christian life, the riches of divine grace in the soul, and the plentiful supply of the Spirit of promise, sealing them, as heirs of promise, to the day of redemption.†

It would take us too far from our immediate object to enter at

* Part I. c. iv.

† This line of remark, as before observed, p. 95, deprives Arminian writers of one favourite method of evading the statements of Scripture, on the subject of election. They seem to think it enough to prevent the application of what is said in the 9th chap. of Romans, the 1st of Ephesians, and other places, to the personal election of individual believers to salvation, if they can show, that election in the case of the Israelites, to which reference is made in the places mentioned, was only to outward favours, and not to eternal life; that hence, as a kind of matter of course, election now is only the election of churches to the means of grace, or at the most, the calling of individuals to the knowledge of salvation by Christ Jesus. (See for ex., Whitby on Rom. ix. 11.) That is, against all reason and analogy, the antitype is on the same ground and level with the type,—outward in the one case, it remains equally outward in the other.

length into the scriptural proof of this doctrine. But to show more distinctly the perfect accordance in this respect which subsists between what is prefigured in the one dispensation, and plainly taught in the other, we must refer to a few passages. To say nothing of the 9th chapter of Romans, which never has been, and never can be satisfactorily explained on any other ground, than that of an election of individuals to eternal life, we read in the 8th chapter of the same Epistle, of believers being "predestinated (i. e. appointed as the result of the decree of election,) to be conformed to the image of God's Son." What can be more inward and personal than this, a conformity to the blessed image of Jesus? Yet to this believers are elected and destined by God, and that not as a class, but as individuals; for "*whom* he did foreknow, *them* he also did predestinate;" and the challenge, it enables one and all of them to take up, is, "who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" Our Lord speaks of a time, when deceivers would arise with such terrible power, that "if it were possible, they would deceive the very elect,"*—evidently implying, that the security of these standing in the sure and settled purpose of God, the event could not actually take place. He says again, that "all whom the Father gave to him, should come to him," which, viewed in connexion with that other saying, "no man can come to me except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him,"† obliges us to refer all personal interest in salvation, up to the will and purpose of God. What else can be inferred also from the fact stated concerning some in the apostolic age, viz. "that as many as were ordained to eternal life believed?"‡ evidently declaring their personal election of God to be the ground and source of their faith in Christ.—Not less clear and explicit is the testimony of Peter, when he describes genuine believers as "elect according to the foreknowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus;"§ for this assuredly was no election to any outward favour or privilege, but to a personal interest in salvation, which could not be affirmed of churches simply as such. Nothing, however, can exceed the simplicity and definiteness of the statement, given by the apostle Paul on this point, in the beginning of his Epistle to the Ephesians: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved." With what is it, that the persons here spoken of, are said to be blessed? With all *spiritual blessings*. In bestowing these upon them, according to what does

* Matth. xxiv. 24. † John vi. 37, 44. ‡ Acts xiii. 48.
§ 1 Pet. i. 2; for meaning of the latter part of the verse, see p. 154.

God proceed? Is it on account of their having chosen him? No, but "according as *he* hath chosen us." When did he do so? "Before the foundation of the world." But did he not choose them because he foresaw they would be holy, and as such deserving of the choice? On the contrary, whatever they might have to distinguish them in this respect, was the result of their being chosen; they were chosen that "they *should* be holy." In what then, does their sure and absolute appointment to the gifts of grace, and the blessings of salvation, originate? "In the good pleasure of God's will." And to what does it redound as its final end? "To the praise of the glory of his grace."

(1.) What a call does not this doctrine furnish to utter self-renunciation and abasement, to lowly, creaturely dependence on God, in the professed disciples of Jesus! In all that concerns their peace with God, and their hopes of salvation, they must feel themselves to be nothing, and regard God as all. It is of him alone, that they, or any others, have become vessels of honour, and heirs of blessing. The day-spring, which has lightened their gloom, and brought to them the prospect of a better inheritance, has risen in their hearts solely by his disposal, and at his bidding. And however early, in any case, their desires and efforts may have been directed toward God, still it is his election of them, not their choice of him, in which the real well-spring of their salvation must be sought. The confession of one and all must be this, "By the grace of God we are what we are."

Ah! here it is most of all, that the axe is laid to the root of man's apostacy, and spirit of alienation from the living God. He would fain be independent of his Creator, and grow out of his own root,—would fain be indebted to his own will, and his own arm for salvation, if not in providing its inheritance of blessing, at least in securing his personal interest in its riches. The pride and self-sufficiency of the heart retreats here as to its last asylum, and will hardly quit its hold. But there is no alternative for thee, whoever thou art, that wouldst make thy calling and election sure. Thou must wholly renounce self, and cast the burden of thy soul on the will and sovereignty of a gracious God. Thou must go and deal with him, not as a wise and prudent one, who can devise for himself the path of life, nor as one who has something of his own to bring, but simply as a babe seeking its light and food, its safety and well-being, from the hand of him who gave it birth. Blessed are they who thus submit themselves to the goodness and mercy of God! It is the true standing and wisdom of a creature, meekly resolving its will into the will of the Creator, and hanging in dependence on his arm of might and love. It is to take the child's part of yielding and confiding, as opposed to the rebel's part of grudging and resisting; and whenever taken, may justly be hailed as the commencing dawn of an eternal day.

(2.) When God's sovereignty is thus owned, and his message of salvation in Christ received with humble, childlike dependence, there is much comfort and encouragement in the doctrine. Often,

indeed, it is perverted by Satan's subtlety into the very reverse, and used as a weapon of alarm or despair,—which it may be whenever thrust out of its proper place, and men seek to know that first, which in the order of their experience must be last ascertained, their relation to the final purposes of God. The man who would know with safety the seasons of the year, when it is time for him to plough and sow, to reap and gather in, must not perplex and weary himself by high inquiries into the position of the sun in the firmament and the courses of the stars, but must look with an attentive eye on the state and progress of things in the field of observation around him. In like manner, the man who would be assured of the path of salvation and his own connexion therewith, must direct his thoughts and efforts to what lies open before him in the written word of God, and the conformity of his heart and conduct to the things there revealed,—not meddling with matters too high for him, by attempting to search into the hidden purposes of God. The way to learn and read out these is by considering what he has received and done in the work of salvation by Jesus Christ; for it is only by being able to mark in this respect the fruits of divine grace, that he can "know his election of God." But when he does come thus to know it, what a deep ground of comfort and confidence in the Lord does it provide for him? Once risen to this height of blessed assurance, he can rest with holy satisfaction in the thought that his salvation stands, not in his own feeble and uncertain resolves, but in the eternal counsel of Him "whose gifts and calling are without repentance." He can now identify his best interests with the will and purpose of an unchangeable God; so that for the work of holy obedience, he can reckon with confidence on the operation of divine grace, "working in him both to will and to do," and for the issue of his course, can joyfully anticipate that he "who has begun a good work in him, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." For "God is the rock, his work is perfect, his ways are judgment," and "whom he loves, he loves unto the end."

SECTION SECOND.

ENMITY OF THE WORLD AGAINST GOD'S PURPOSE OF ELECTION.

Nearly connected with the principle just considered is another in the divine government, which respects the treatment of the elect seed in the world; viz. that their being the objects of God's choice, and the recipients of his peculiar blessing, is not inconsistent with their being exposed to much malice and hostility on the part of the enemy. This was announced as a general truth in the declaration which was made by God himself, regarding the enmity that should exist between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. But it was reserved for the events of God's providence to determine in what particular sense that general announcement was to be understood—what should be the nature of the enmity proceeding from the one party to the other, and whether the two

seeds spoken of indicated two separate orders of beings, or two divisions merely of the human family itself. The stream of time did not proceed far, till the events which it produced began to throw a clear and determinate light upon these important questions. For it soon appeared in the history of Cain and Abel, that the tempter, as well as God, was to have a party and an interest in this world; that there was to be a portion of Adam's family falling in with his wicked designs and breathing his envenomed spirit, walking after the flesh, and preferring the gratifications of sense to the honour and service of God. These might fitly be called Satan's seed rather than the woman's, who was now destined, in the mercy of God, to be the mother of a conquering seed, resisting the tempter, and at last bruising his head beneath their feet. But though the two grand divisions of mankind were thus to be, the one children, the other enemies of God—the one heirs of salvation, the other appointed to destruction with the devil and his angels, it was ere long found to be the design of God to suffer the former, not only to be the object of the latter's enmity here, but also to be in many respects, and so far as that enmity could reach, the injured and afflicted party. Unreasonable and cruel as Cain's hatred to his brother was, it was yet permitted to bring Abel to an untimely grave. And so malevolent and scowling was the spirit which reigned among the family and adherents of that first apostate, that it was some time before the sincere worshippers of God durst venture publicly to call upon his name.* Nor can we doubt that those deeds of violence and renown in which the giants of the antediluvian world sought to display their lawless power, were often turned with peculiar bitterness against the saints of the Most High, and had no small influence in wearing them down to such an exceedingly small remnant as they formed in the days of Noah.

When the doctrine of election again rose prominently to view in the family of Abraham, how soon do we perceive the spite and malice of the enemy's seed turned against those on whom God bestowed the special tokens of his favour! Ishmael, when still a youth, began shortly after the birth of Isaac to mock at the joy which was manifested on behalf of this child of promise, and showed the elements, at least, of that carnal, persecuting spirit which had already wrought so violently in Cain and his party. The same spirit breaks out anew, and with increased violence, in Esau, provoked no doubt by the ungenerous conduct of his brother, but chiefly influenced by the undoubted fact of Heaven's choice having passed by him through the elder, and settled on the younger son Jacob. And when Jacob's family grew into a numerous people, though an extraordinary turn in God's providence constrained the

* "Then (i. e. about the birth of Adam's grandson, Enos) men began to call upon the name of the Lord." Gen. iv. 26. Not that till this time there was no worship of God, but that the terror inspired by Cain's murder of Abel, and the fierce and malignant spirit of his party, filled the minds of the better portion with consternation, and it was a considerable time before they ventured on celebrating God's worship in an open and public manner. This is what both the circumstances and the expression itself lead us to believe.

world for a time to honour them, as his chosen instruments for blessing it, yet how soon did the very signs of Heaven's favour toward them prove the occasion of the world's envy! How heavily did the hand of Satan for a long time press on them through those Pharaohs, who were then the great heads and promoters of his interest on earth! And even after their settlement in the land of Canaan—if we view them as a whole, God's professing church, his peculiar treasure, we find them begirt on every side with many vigilant enemies, who eyed them with bitter jealousy, and eagerly sought opportunities against them—or if we view them as divided among themselves into the two great sections of a carnal and a spiritual seed, as they certainly appear especially in the times of David, and at various periods of a later date, we see the same warrings of the flesh against the spirit, the men of God's choice and blessing plied with all manner of evil by those, who had neither the fear of God before their eyes nor the sense of his favour upon their souls.

It was a melancholy sign how little the Jews of our Saviour's time had profited by the lessons of the past, and how ill they understood the import of preceding dispensations in this respect, when they looked for a Messiah, who should be hailed with acclamations by the nation of Israel merely as such, and should gather men of all characters around his standard. Himself pre-eminently, the elect of God, and the head of an elect seed, the more sure of experiencing the inveterate malice and hatred of the enemy's seed, that they were to rise to higher attainments in the life and blessing of God, no principle of God's government in former times was more certain to re-appear on the theatre of Messiah's kingdom, than the one now under consideration. Nor could any expectations have been more completely verified. Our Lord at once declared the substance of his own experience in this respect, and foretold his people's, when he said, "The servant is not greater than his Lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you. Because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."*

For the truth of this testimony in the case of Jesus himself, we have only to appeal to the faithful record of the Evangelists, which every where bears witness to his having been treated as a "worm, and no man," the one whom above all others "man despised, and the nation abhorred." And the history of his church in every age, bears witness to the truth of it, in the case of his sincere followers, who have really trodden in his footsteps. It is proper to notice, however, that the more inward and spiritual character of the gospel dispensation, has brought with it a considerable change in the usual manifestations of the principle in question. The enmity suffered to proceed from the serpent's brood does not now wreak its malice so exclusively upon the outward state and condition of men. It is levelled more against the spiritual views, principles and conduct,

* John xv. 19, 20; Matth. x. 25.

which form practically the essential distinction between believers and the world at large, and in which their real well-being consists. "The kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" the higher any individual rises in the possession and experience of these, the more is he the subject of divine love and blessing; and to move men from the simplicity of the faith by heresies in doctrine, or corruptions in practice, to rob them of their interest in the Lord, or at least to mar their inheritance of peace and joy in believing, by working on the flesh with fears of temporal loss, or allurements of worldly pleasure,—these are the great objects to which the enmity of Satan is now directed, and it is only in so far as he succeeds in such things, that he can be said to gain any real advantage over the children of God. Doubtless, it is still a part of Satan's policy in the world, to inflict, through means of his earthly instruments, outward mischief of various kinds, upon those who are opposed to his interest in the world. But the end chiefly sought in such things, is of a spiritual, rather than of an earthly nature. A simple manifestation of envious or malignant feeling toward the chosen seed, producing and terminating in certain temporal evils, is rarely to be met with in Christian times, however common in earlier periods of the church's history; those evils have commonly been employed as mere weapons for reaching the higher object of shaking the steadfastness, subverting the faith, and quenching the inward life of the sufferers. What the Pharaohs of Egypt sought by the cruel oppressions they practised on the defenceless Israelites, was merely to prevent their outward increase, and crush their political strength. But the persecutions waged by the emperors and popes of Rome, had for their aim the higher object of compelling men to abandon their sacred principles, and arresting the progress of the truth. An enmity there is alike in both periods of the world's history, giving rise to a severe, earnest, and continued conflict; but with the economy of God, the conflict also has risen in the latter period, more into the region of the inner man, and seeks its results in the interests and concerns of a divine life. What the world most of all envies in true Christians, and what chiefly provokes their ungodly spleen, is not so much any temporal advantage, or political strength, these may happen to possess, as their experience of God's love, their freedom from corruption, their abounding in the fruits of righteousness, their comparative deadness to the world, and their noble indifference, as well to its lighter follies, as to its grosser impurities. Such things cannot exist in any large measure, without drawing upon them the scorn and opposition of the world, which will naturally show itself in attempts to move those, that have them, by means of false insinuations, allurements, taunts, or threatenings of evil, to forsake the truth and interest of Jesus, out of which the whole springs as its fountain-head.

When Christ, therefore, so plainly forewarned his followers, that "the world would hate them, even as it had hated him," and when the Apostle Paul lays it down as a general principle, that "all who

will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution," or again, that their suffering with Christ here, is the necessary forerunner of their reigning with him hereafter, (2 Tim. iii. 12; Rom. viii. 17,) —they are given to understand, that the old enmity between God's chosen seed, and the children of the wicked one, is to be kept up during the course of the present dispensation. If the professing followers of Jesus expect it to be otherwise, they utterly misconceive the proper nature of their calling in him; and if they are themselves in a condition, in which the world finds nothing to call forth its jealousy or spite, it is but too clear a proof, that the world sees in them of its own, and that they are living in that unhallowed friendship with it, which is denounced as enmity to God and his cause, (1 John ii. 15, 16, Luke vi. 26.) It is true, however, that the manner in which the world manifests its contrariety to the followers of the cross, admits of manifold degrees of malice, and endless forms of manifestation. If it should from time to time appear in such intensity, as to breathe slaughter and threatenings against the flock of Christ, this is no more than what the history of the past, and the very principles of the kingdom of God fully warrant us to look for. At the same time, the society in which we live, may be so leavened by the spirit of the gospel, and those, who yet remain substantially on the side of the world, may have come so near to the kingdom of God, that the very brightest examples of living piety, may call forth nothing but an occasional sneer, or some indications of a desire to have the standard lowered, which they raise for God and his truth. Nor should it ever be forgotten, on the other hand, that while Christians should exhibit a firm and undaunted resolution to do nothing against the truth, and to remain steadfast even unto death, it is their solemn duty, both to Christ and to the world, to beware of doing any thing that may needlessly provoke the enmity of carnal men, or afford them any just handle for their opposition to the truth. Too often has occasion been given to the enemies of God to blaspheme by the sins and backslidings of his own people; and seldom has a fleshly Esau long wanted his halting Jacob as a pretext under which to cover his hostility to the cause of Heaven, and indulge his malignant feelings. Deep must ever be the guilt of those, who thus wound Jesus in the house of his friends, and deliver up his glory into the enemies' hands. However much they may suffer in such cases, it is not for well-doing, but for evil-doing; it is not that suffering for righteousness' sake, which consists in being spoken against *falsely*, or treated *wrongfully*, and which never comes without a blessing; but is a ground of deserved condemnation and rebuke. And if the love of Christ should constrain his people to live, not to themselves, but to him, the thought, that they are in him a chosen generation, called out of the world, and commanded to be as witnesses against its evil, should exert a powerful influence in inducing them to live indeed as sons of God, "blameless and harmless, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation," that they may shine as lights in the world, and not only cut off all just occa-

sion from the adversaries, but even lead them "to glorify God in the day of their visitation."

SECTION III.

THE TWOFOLD PROCESS, SALVATION WITH DESTRUCTION.

The next principle, which meets us in the development of God's typical dispensations, respects the twofold process, which ever discloses itself in connexion with God's electing grace, and according to which salvation is wrought out in the chosen, by means of judgment and destruction upon the adversary. The world at large, as we have seen, is the theatre of a divided empire, the region where two separate and directly opposite interests contend for the mastery. And not only so, but the person of each single believer is itself a battle-field, on which substantially the same conflict is maintained, there being there also an old man and a new, a body of death, or the flesh of sin, on the side of Satan, and the spirit of holiness working unto life everlasting, on the side of God. And the great principle, which in connexion with this, the Lord began to bring out, even at an early period in his church, is that referred to in the twofold process; viz. that salvation is to be obtained by the inflicting of judgment, and the executing of destruction on that which belongs to the interest of the adversary. When did this principle in the divine government first begin to come clearly and prominently out? Its first grand and palpable manifestation was in the occurrences of the deluge.*

* We may possibly seem, for the sake of keeping up a more regular chain and continuity of principles, to have omitted some important typical matter between the points last noticed in antediluvian history, and the era of the deluge. It is not our object, however, to search out every typical element, but only what may be called the more important links of the chain. At the same time, we are satisfied, that in this portion, nothing properly typical has been omitted. Our older writers, certainly, found much of this in Enoch,—his name, (dedicated,)—his age, 365 years, like the days of the sun's revolution, (Ps. lxxxix. 36,)—his pure and blameless life—his faithful preaching of righteousness and judgment to a sinful world,—and finally, his translation to heaven without tasting death:—all these have been reckoned, even by some of the more judicious, as types of Christ, (see for ex., Mather, p. 67.) It is scarcely necessary to make any remark, on the first two of the above circumstances in Enoch's life; their own puerility is a sufficient refutation. Then the next two are so general, that they can be regarded as typical of Christ, only because all real excellence, and all faithful ministrations in the church, were destined to find their highest idea, and most perfect exemplification in him. And with reference to the last, which is the only very striking and prominent event in his history, the inspired record is too silent, in regard to the purposes for which it was appointed, and the manner in which it was effected, to say much of any typical sign connected with it. Negatively, however, we may say, that Enoch's translation cannot properly be viewed as typifying Christ's ascension into heaven,—for the most striking features in the two cases, are not only diverse, but precisely opposite,—Enoch being translated that he should not see death, Christ not being able to enter into his glory, till he had tasted death for every man. The translation of the patriarch took place for the very purpose of avoiding, what, in the supposed antitype, was the most absolutely indispensable. Besides, if his translation be regarded simply as an ascension into heaven, it could not strictly be the type of another; there were then no rising from a lower to a higher stage; it were the same thing with no change, but that of the person who was the subject of it. Or, if regarded in the light of a translation, implying a change from the earthly to the heavenly state, then Christ's ascension was no translation; he was already from the period of the resurrection in glorified humanity, and heaven was his

It was not then, however, brought for the first time under the notice of the church. As a general principle in the scheme of grace, it appears in the earliest intimation of God's purpose of redemption, which not only assured man of a deliverance from the ruin of the fall, but gave him to understand, that this deliverance should proceed by executions of judgment upon the adversary, and should be completed only by the final overthrow and death of the destroyer,—"it shall bruise thy head." From the first, therefore, it was announced, that the work of salvation carried in its bosom a process of destruction, and that in the accomplishment of the one, the other should be made perfect. The same principle was also to some extent involved in the prophecy of Enoch, which proclaimed "the coming of the Lord to execute judgment upon sinners for their hard speeches and ungodly deeds;" for it was as enemies of the cause of God, that this was denounced against them, so that their destruction inevitably implied its vindication and triumph,—implied, that the former was to take place for the sake of the latter. But up to the period of the deluge, no manifest sign appeared from heaven, of the practical adoption of this principle into the divine government. Indeed, to the eye of sense, matters till then carried a contrary aspect, and it seemed, especially in the declining ages of the antediluvian world, as if it was the seed of the serpent, rather than that of the woman, which was to triumph, as if impiety and corruption were to gain the perpetual ascendant in the earth over faith and holiness.

Another aspect, however, presented itself, when the waters of the deluge burst forth upon the earth, coming as they did for the double purpose of sweeping into perdition the overgrown, incurable mass of corruption, while they kept in secure preservation the small remnant of piety and worth. If we look thus simply at the outward results produced by that remarkable visitation of God, we perceive them to have been twofold. But if we examine the matter a little more closely, we shall find, that there was a necessary connexion between these two results, and that there was properly but one object aimed at in the dispensation, which could only be reached through the operation of a double process. What was the object in question? It was the saving of Noah and his house, (1 Pet. iii. 20,) as the spiritual seed of God. And saving them from what? Not surely from the fury and desolation of the waters, as might be supposed from the loose and popular representations which are

proper home; his ascension was only a change of place, not of condition.—The translation of Enoch, like that of Elijah in another age, is best viewed as a miraculous fact, a great and peculiar sign from heaven, and as such standing apart from all the other events of providence; a special intervention of Heaven, to awaken an ungodly generation to the realities of a higher world, and the interests of a coming eternity. It was thus eminently fitted, and we doubt not was mainly intended, to serve as the seal of Heaven to those predictions which Enoch was commissioned to deliver regarding the judgment of God against all unrighteousness,—as a solemn warning to the wicked, that they might be staid in their heaven-daring career of profligacy and crime,—and as an encouragement to the righteous to abide faithful, notwithstanding the strong tide of degeneracy that was setting in around them, under the assurance that the Lord knew them, and would soon receive them to himself.

often given of it; for then the watery element would have acted as the preservative against itself, which were absurd, and the persons saved are expressly said to have been saved by the water, and not from it.* From what then were they saved? Unquestionably from that, which, before the coming of the deluge, formed the real element of danger, the corruption, enmity, and violence of ungodly men. By the combined operation of these, the church of God had already been reduced to the greatest extremities, and stood, we may say, upon the verge of utter extinction. The irreligious principles, pernicious example, and outrageous proceedings of the wicked portion of Adam's family, had succeeded in drawing within its wild vortex nearly the entire human race. One single family was headed by a man, who remained steadfast in the faith and worship of the living God, and he, "like a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, like a besieged city,"—the object of a world's envenomed malice and profane scorn,—taunted, reviled, buffeted, plied in short with every weapon that was likely to overcome his constancy, and if not in his own person, at least in his family, in the utmost danger of being carried headlong with the swelling tide of wickedness, and making shipwreck of faith and a good conscience. It was to save him, and with him the interest of God in the world from this imminent danger, that the flood was sent; and it could only do so by completely separating between him and the seed of evil-doers,—engulfing them in ruin, and sustaining uninjured the ark in which he resided

* I am aware many eminent scholars give a different turn to this expression in Peter, and hold the proper rendering to be, "saved through (i. e. in the midst of) the water,"—the water being considered as the space or region, through which the ark was required to bear Noah in safety. So Beza, who says, that "the water cannot be taken for the instrumental cause, as Noah was preserved from the water, not by it;" so also Titmann, Bib. Cab. Vol. XVIII. p. 251; Steiger, in loco, with only a minute shade of difference; Robinson in Lex., and many others. But this view is open to the following objections. 1. The "water" is here introduced, not as made up of parts, as a space or region to be traversed, but simply as one whole, an agent or instrument. Had the former been intended, it would have been, not "through water," but "through *the waters*." But as it was, it mattered nothing whether the ark remained stationary at one point on the surface of the waters, or was borne from one place to another; and so, *through*, in the sense of *passing through*, or *through among*, is not suitable. That Noah needed to be saved rather *from* the water, than *by* it, is a superficial objection, proceeding on the false ground, that the water had the same relation to Noah, that it had to the world at large. For him the water stood in a necessary connexion with the ark, which without the water would have been but a foolish idea; it took both to make up the means of his deliverance. In the same sense, and on the same account, we might say of the Red Sea, (as the apostle, indeed, virtually says of it, 1 Cor. x. 2,) that the Israelites were saved by it,—for though in itself a source of danger, yet, by God's appointment, it became the occasion and instrument of deliverance. 2. The application made of Noah's preservation to baptism by the apostle, requires the agency of the water as well as of the ark to be taken into account. Indeed, according to the best MSS., (which read ὃ καί,) the reference to the antitype is specially to the water. And even apart from that, baptism is spoken of as a saving, in consequence of its being a purifying ordinance, which implies, as in the deluge, that the salvation is made good along with, and through means of, a destruction. This is substantially admitted by Steiger, who, though he adopts the rendering "through the water," yet, in explaining the connexion between the type and the antitype, he is obliged to view the water as instrumental to salvation: "the flood was for Noah a baptism, and as such saved; the same element, water, also saves us now, not however as mere water, but in the same quality as a baptism."

as his home. So that the deluge, considered as Noah's baptism, or the means of his temporal salvation, was not less essentially connected with a work of judgment, than with a work of deliverance; indeed, it was properly by the one that the other was accomplished, and the support of the ark on the bosom of the waters was not so directly the object of the deluge, as the execution of judgment on that wicked race, whose hardened and hopeless impenitence was the real danger from which the elect seed of God needed to be protected and saved.

The same twofold process again becomes prominent in the history of God's people, at the next great crisis of deliverance—the rescue of Israel from the bondage and oppression of Egypt. It were easy to conceive how this might have been accomplished in peace and quietness, at least with no farther violence done to the adversary, than what might have been necessary to overawe his heart, and constrain him to allow Israel to retire from his dominion. But instead of this, and no doubt for the purpose of rendering the mode of procedure a correct representation of what was afterwards to be done in Messiah's kingdom—an embodiment of its great principles, we see God ordering every thing from the first concerning it, so as to insure the infliction of signal judgment on the adversary, and through that to work out the deliverance of his people. Hence, while many signs and wonders were to be wrought before Pharaoh, these were to be produced in such a manner as to admit of, or rather to contribute to, the hardening of his heart, that Israel might not obtain his release without the experience of a dreadful overthrow on the part of his oppressors. And so one stroke of judgment after another alights upon the land of the adversary, until by the very accumulation of woes no power is left to resist any longer. The people, whom the Lord had chosen for his peculiar treasure, are brought out from their house of bondage, when the arm of those who held them captive was broken, and their heart melting like wax before the fire, under the severity of God's rebuke. And, as if even that had not been enough—to show that the very head of the serpent must be bruised before the work of deliverance could be completed, Pharaoh was permitted to rally his forces for a little and renew the conflict, that he might be overwhelmed in destruction at the very moment that the Israelites escaped for ever beyond his reach. Hence it is written of them, in language similar to that employed of the deluge, that "they all passed through the sea, and were baptized unto Moses in the sea;" its waters were the instrument of their temporal salvation, not simply by opening for them a way of escape, but also and chiefly by returning to immerse their enemies in irrecoverable perdition. It was only, when they saw from the other side, "the great work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians," saw "the horse and the rider thrown into the sea," that they could take up the song of victory and triumph as the subjects of a perfected deliverance.

But there was another class of enemies, with which those Israelites had to contend, even after they had become personally free—

enemies who held possession of the inheritance to which they were destined, and barred the way of their access to it. Here again the work of salvation or deliverance had to be carried into effect by a process of destruction; and it is not till the powers of the adversary are broken in pieces and dispersed, that the full dowry of promised blessing is enjoyed. The fall of the one is the rise and glory of the other. And when, at a subsequent period, Israel was again, on account of sin, driven from his inheritance, and again needed to be delivered from the hands of the enemy, we find the deliverance achieved by a like process of destruction. The captives in Babylon were not to be released by a simple change of mind on the part of the reigning monarch, loosing of his own accord the chains of bondage and letting the prisoners go free. No, Babylon herself was first to be brought down from her pride of strength, and given into the hands of another, that a way of escape might be opened for the Lord's people. When the prophets foretold to the afflicted exiles a gracious return of the Lord's favour in that house of bondage, they constantly did so by proclaiming judgment and wrath upon the king and city of Babylon; the day of vengeance upon her was to be the day of redemption for them; and the commission to Cyrus to open the two-leaved gates and abase the pride of the Chaldean's excellency, was expressly said to be given by the Lord, "for the sake of Jacob his servant, and Israel his elect," that it might be "said to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." (Isa. xliv. xlv. Jer. xxv., and especially ch. l. and li., where we find the destruction of Babylon constantly alternating with the redemption of Israel.) Thus the purpose of mercy and deliverance to the chosen, carried along with it the execution of a doom upon the adversary, and in this received its accomplishment.

In seeking for the new and higher manifestation of this twofold process in the kingdom of Christ, the language of prophecy already leads us to think of the work of Christ himself; for it was foretold of him, that he should at once "proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God," and this day of vengeance should also be the year of the redeemed, (Isa. lxi. 3, lxiii. 4.) So Christ himself declares, that the end of his work in the flesh was to judge and cast out the prince of this world, (John xii. 31, xvi. 11;) and it is elsewhere said, that by dying he spoiled principalities and powers, and destroyed him that had the power of death, (Col. ii. 14, Heb. ii. 14,) thereby bringing deliverance to those who were in fear and bondage. The truth of God, therefore, is, that redemption carries along with it a work of judgment, as well as of deliverance; it is made up of the double process, salvation with destruction, the one being effected through the execution of the other. While Christ's death upon the cross provided an atonement for the guilt of sin, it at the same time bruised the head of the serpent, and brought Christ's spiritual seed out of the reach of those formidable and otherwise overwhelming, destroying evils, which the adversary had prevailed to bring into their condition.

Not that the adversary had any proper right to lord it over man, even when fallen, and make him the prey of his mischievous and cruel purposes. Man was still God's creature; none but God had any right to exercise dominion over him, to direct his course, and regulate his condition; and if another interfered to do so, it could only be as a thief and a robber, intruding where he had no right, and usurping what was not his own. But sin having entered and broken up the relation between man and God, an opportunity was given for Satan also entering in that thievish character, and setting up his unrighteous and cruel dominion over men, as God's permitted scourge on account of sin, and the executioner of that sentence of death, which was decreed against it. Hence the redemption that was to be provided must at once destroy and save—save, indeed, by destroying—cast this cruel oppressor down from his ill-gotten supremacy, and so, relieve the besieged, enthralled, devil-possessed nature of man, and raise it anew into the blessedness and freedom of life which belong to God's dear children. How was this done? Simply by Christ's bearing the curse, which separated between us and God, and so allowed Satan to get a footing for his dominion and prosecute his work of destruction. Sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, the house of our humanity, which he seized for his lawful prey, is placed upon a new and better foundation; it is sanctified and made holiness to the Lord; by faith made one with Christ in his work of infinite value, the spoiler cannot harm us; nay, he is himself spoiled of the ground on which his usurped dominion was based; the hand-writing of condemnation that was against us, has been nailed with Christ's body to the cross; the adversary has lost his bill of indictment, his weapons of war have perished, he has been bound and cast out by one mightier than himself; so that we are escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler, recovered from that territory of sin and death, where alone he had any power to injure or destroy, and placed within the blessed region of the Spirit, whose working is unto holiness and life everlasting.

Should not this be hailed as glad tidings by all to whom the knowledge of it comes? Is it not a joyous thing for the captive to know and feel that the power which enthralled him is laid low? But surely for none so much as the poor victim of sin, when effectually convinced by the Spirit of God, that the prince of this world is judged and cast out, so that there is no longer any curse to pour on him its bitterness, no hostile power in the universe entitled to do him harm. For him, the dark night of condemnation is past, and the clear light of heaven shines. The love and faithfulness, even the justice and power of God are on his side, pledged for Christ's sake to save him from the paw of the lion, and deliver him no more into the hand of the strong. Why should any fear or gloom settle upon *his* heart? What room is there for him to doubt of a happy and triumphant issue? Let him but enter, as he is invited, into the spoils of Christ's victory, and cling, in the simplicity of faith, to him who has prevailed in the conflict, and nothing can disappoint him of his reward; he, too, shall bruise Satan un-

der his feet, and receive the crown of righteousness prepared for those that overcome.

But the application made by Peter to baptism, of the things which happened to Noah, suggests to us another way in which this twofold process appears in the kingdom of Christ—one that has for its field of operation the personal experience of believers. Indeed, even without any special information from the pen of inspiration we might have concluded such to be the case, as we know it to be a settled principle in the divine procedure, that Christ's people must be all baptized with his baptism, and tread substantially in his footsteps. Only, having become themselves personally subject to the evil, the enemy having obtained a footing in their very natures, the destruction, as well as the salvation, must in their case take place upon themselves; they must have experience of both parts of the process.—But now for the apostle's explanation: "The like figure whereunto (or literally: the antitype to which, viz. Noah's salvation by water) even baptism, doth also now save us;—not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God—by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," (1 Pet. iii. 21.) Christian baptism is here plainly declared to be the antitype to Noah's; in other words, the deliverance effected for him by means of the circumstances of the deluge, was a type or shadow of that higher, spiritual deliverance, which is the object of baptism, as an ordinance in the church of Christ. But what is the baptism which is attended with such results? The apostle explains this in the clause, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,—not the laying aside merely of carnal defilement, but something farther—the answer of a good conscience toward God;" or rather, the interrogation, the inquiry of a good conscience unto God, namely in the matter of salvation—the unfeigned desire and application of the soul to God for an interest in that salvation, of which baptism is the outward seal and token.* The water of baptism of itself can no more save us, than the water of the deluge by itself, and apart from any particular state of mind in Noah, could have saved him. It became an instrument or occasion of deliverance to him, only from his having faith in the word of God, which gave intimation of a coming deluge, and directed him to the suitable method of preparation; his salvation was the result of his faith in the operation of God. And so is it also in regard to baptism, which brings assurance of salvation, only when it is connected in the recipient with such a state of mind, as is sincerely desirous to be purged from pollution, and of possessing an interest in the salvation of God. In that case baptism does save; yet not even then as of itself, but only, as the apostle adds, through the resurrection of Christ. For salvation, as a matter of experience, is the possession of a new, spiritual, and blessed life, in which the soul, freed from the old man of corruption, that is from the power and condemnation of sin, enjoys and exercises the glorious liberty of God's children: and of such a life Christ, in his risen glory, is

* See Elsner, Bengel, Steiger, on the passage.

the sole spring and fountainhead. For as in his death he stood and suffered in our room for sin, and thereby acquired both the right and the power to set humanity free from the condemnation of God, and its consequent bondage in sin; so by his resurrection he was raised in our behalf to be the head of a new creature, or spiritual seed, who derive from him a divine nature, and grow up continually to his likeness. Quickened by his Spirit, they are enabled to put off and bury, as it were, in the tomb, the body of sin and corruption which they naturally bear about with them, and to cultivate the graces of that heavenly life, which alone can prepare them for the inheritance of his kingdom. So that we have here, in the higher region of the spiritual life, the doing over again of what took place in the lower sphere of Noah's temporal life; we have the inward experience of a salvation working itself out by a destruction of the powers and elements of evil,—breaking up the old constitution of nature, purging away its defilements, and bringing to naught its malice and enmity, that the holy seed of a divine nature may have room to live, and grow, and bring forth fruit to perfection. You have only, therefore, to look to what was done in the one case, and learn what you have reason to expect, or are called to do in the other. Would you fain spare and cherish the lusts of the old man of corruption? Remember for your warning how God spared not the old world, but doomed its corrupt inhabitants in one mass to the gulf of perdition. Seems it too formidable a task, and one well-nigh hopeless, for you to contend with the giant forces that are against you? Remember for your encouragement, how God sunk in his devouring flood the mighty men of old; the men of renown, who warred with his church and wasted it, till they had brought it to the brink of ruin, yet even then were found neither too many nor too strong to be made monuments of ruin. Or, does it appear strange, almost incredible, that *your* heart should be made the subject of a work, which concentrates upon itself the peculiar regard and gracious operations of Godhead, while thousands are left entire strangers to it, and that the instrument by which it is effected, the word of life, should even be to them the occasion of death and condemnation? Behold Noah and his little household alone preserved amid the wreck of a whole world, preserved too by faith in a word of God, which carried in its bosom the doom of myriads of their fellow-creatures, and so converting that which to others was a minister of vengeance, into an element of peace and safety to them. And doubt not, that what was then done in the outward field of providence and for the sake of a temporal preservation, shall be ever finding its parallel in the things which concern that hidden work of grace, by which an elect seed are ripened and prepared for the habitations of glory.

Substantially the same line of reflection might be pursued in reference to the other facts already noticed of Old Testament history. But in doing so, it is necessary to keep prominently in view the real nature and object of the respective transactions. For example, the deluge must be considered, not in all its circumstances

of minute detail, but in the grand purpose for which it was sent, as a sort of baptism to Noah, or outward ordinance, by means of which, through faith in the word of God, he found deliverance from the dangers to which he was exposed, and reached a condition of peace and safety. This is precisely what baptism is designed to do for the spiritual life, as an instituted means by which, through faith in the word of God, there is represented, sealed, and applied, such an interest in Christ as secures deliverance from the power of sin, inherent in fallen flesh, and renders the soul free to exercise itself in newness of life to God. These are the great lines of the resemblance, and little good can be done by pushing the matter more into detail. Indeed, it is scarcely possible to do so without confounding things which essentially differ, and losing sight of the main points of agreement. Thus, the ark may be, and most commonly is, viewed as representing the church, in which God's faithful people ride secure amid the swelling waves and perilous storms of life. And for general purposes the representation may be liable to no objection, as the truth embodied in it is certainly accordant with the word of God. Yet it is not strictly accurate; the real typical bearings of the subject are to some extent lost sight of, and others substituted in their place; for it contemplates the waters of the deluge as having the same aspect to Noah, that they had to the wicked—as the grand source of danger, from which he needed protection and deliverance. This is not, as we have seen, the correct and scriptural view of the subject, which represents the waters and the ark as together constituting the means of his salvation. And when the connexion between the ark and the church, thus faulty at the commencement, is pursued into the many minor points of resemblance, which are to be found in our older writers;—as when its being anointed with pitch is supposed to have foreshadowed the sprinkling of the church with Christ's blood—the length of time it was in being built, the slow increase of the church in gathering the whole number of the saved—its being formed of many trees closely seamed together, and properly dressed, the church's being composed of many members, sanctified and knit together by the Spirit—its having one door but many rooms, the church's having one Saviour and that Saviour many functions:—when the connexion is drawn out into these and similar points of resemblance, the groundless and fanciful nature of the connexion only becomes the more clear and palpable. The light in which Scripture unfolds the subject, is in no degree chargeable with such conceits; nor will there be any danger of falling into them, if we keep steadily in view the great principle in God's spiritual government, which it was the primary object of the deluge to develope in regard to the present safety and well-being of his church, and which it is equally the object of baptism to develope in regard to the higher sphere of the spiritual and divine life.

Besides these exemplifications, however, of the twofold process of which we have spoken, the one already past in the finished work of Christ, and the other continually proceeding in the present ex-

perience of believers, there is another and final one yet to be expected, when Christ shall come to avenge the cause of his elect, and, putting down all adverse authority and rule, shall exalt them to reign with him in perpetual blessedness and glory. For to the very last, and in nothing more, indeed, than in its last great acts, the work of God in behalf of his church shall bear the character of a redemption from the powers of evil; its final termination and successful issue shall not only be co-eval with, but be accomplished through the destruction of the flesh and all its lusts, the overthrow of the powers of antichrist, the abolition of death, and the utter extirpation of all the forms and instruments of evil, which Satan has been so long employing against the life and blessedness of the saints. For that glorious era, the church of the redeemed, both in heaven and on earth, now waits and longs; for that even sentient nature, as the apostle testifies, may be said to sigh and groan, conscious as she is through all her parts of the sore burden and oppression of evil, and unable to attain to settled peace, or to yield her proper increase to God, until the manifestation of the sons of God in their destined freedom and glory. On this sublime and animating prospect, however, we shall not enter here, as the things which concern it will fall more naturally to be considered afterwards in connexion with other parts of the divine economy. But the thought of what has been done in the like kind during the ages that are past, and of what is even now in progress in the history of every child of God, should be ever used by the church to beget in her the more assured faith of what is still to come, and prepare for the last issues of the work of God. Blessed is he, in whom this faith shall be found, when the Son of man cometh to finish his work in righteousness, and so watcheth as to keep his garments unstained, and his soul ready to meet the bridegroom.

SECTION FOURTH.

THE ROOT OF LIFE AND BLESSING IN THE SAVED—FAITH.

We have seen how the family of man branched itself from the first into two grand divisions, the one holding of God, the other of the serpent; consequently of opposite feelings and interests, and growing, the one to be heirs of salvation, the other of destruction. The original and primary ground of this difference stood, as previously stated, in the election of God. It was necessary, however, that the grace of election should discover itself in some fundamental and distinguishing principle, on the part of those who were the subjects of it, separating them by a broad and certain line of demarkation from the rest of mankind, and rendering them fit to be partakers of the benefits provided for them by the grace of God. What *is* this ground-principle? No sincere inquirer can have any hesitation in answering, faith.

No sooner does the electing grace of God appear, choosing out a portion of Adam's family to occupy a peculiar relation to him-

self, than faith appears also as the immediate link of connexion between the elect seed and God, and the main element of distinction between them and others. It was faith, as we are expressly told in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and as the Old Testament history itself implies, which successively distinguished Abel, Enoch, and Noah, from so many around them, and secured the acceptance of their services with God. Guided by faith, they were each led to worship him in their day and generation according to his own instituted method, in preference to the open contempt of divine things, on the one hand, and the different forms of will-worship, on the other, which were embraced by the children of apostacy. Besides this exercise of faith common to them all, Noah gave a further and very eminent manifestation of it, in relying on the word of God concerning the deluge, and making suitable preparation for it. It was simply his faith on that occasion which rendered the water of the deluge so very different a thing to him from what it was to the rest of mankind, and in its effects so precisely opposite. And by his faith thus exercised in regard to the deluge, it is expressly said in the Hebrews, that he "became heir (or, acquired possession) of the righteousness, which is by faith." The same virtually is said of Abel with respect to his exercise of faith in presenting a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, "he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts," viz. by a visible sign from heaven betokening his acceptance of these on account of the faith in which they were offered. Although the same words are not used, yet unquestionably the same idea is expressed in regard to the faith of Enoch, when it is declared, that before his translation he had the testimony of Heaven, that he pleased God; for this he could have had on no other ground, than his being accounted righteous before God. The cause of man's alienation from God's favour, and expulsion from the tree of life, was sin; and the way of righteousness was of necessity the only channel through which access could be found to the privileges that were lost. But now that sin had entered with its flowing fountain of corruption, and its fearful load of condemnation, no righteousness such as God would accept was attainable by man, excepting through faith; in other words, the righteousness was necessarily of God's, not of man's providing; and the whole that man could do in the matter was to rest in humble, childlike faith upon the word and operation of God.

Now, this faith, we are told, was possessed by Abel, Enoch, and Noah, who by means of it were respectively admitted to a place in the favour and communion of God. But the person in whose history this principle of the divine administration was to receive its brightest manifestation, whose local habitation even, and entire course, were to stand peculiarly identified with it, is Abraham, named on this account "the father of the faithful." In the case of the earlier patriarchs, the doctrine of "righteousness through faith" is too clearly written to admit of any doubt concerning it; but in the case of Abraham it is the grand idea which discovers itself, the central principle around which all the particulars of his

life group themselves, and which meets us at every turn of his eventful history. With him, therefore, it may more fitly be connected, than with any other individual in patriarchal times. The facts of the case may be summed up in a short compass. Abraham is called by God, when residing with his father's family on the plains of Mesopotamia, to go forth to another land, which was to be given him and his seed for an inheritance, the land, as it was afterwards expressly declared, of Canaan; and for a seed to occupy this land, and inherit in connexion with it the peculiar blessing of Heaven, he was to become the head of a numerous offspring, in multitude like the stars of heaven, and the sand upon the sea-shore, and so singularly honoured by God, that through them blessing was to be communicated to all the nations of the earth. These important benefits were at first intimated to Abraham by a word of promise; they were afterwards, with no material alteration, made the terms of a covenant; and finally, that covenant was confirmed by the solemn oath of God, (Gen. xii., xv., xvii., xxii.) That the benefits thus promised and guarantied to Abraham were special tokens of divine favour, such as could be conferred only upon one in nearest fellowship with God, is evident on the slightest reflection —they bespoke him to be in a state of perfect reconciliation with Heaven; nor is it less evident, that they were altogether gifts of grace, depending first for their offer on the sovereign goodness, and thereafter for their fulfilment on the power and faithfulness of God. Abraham was to be throughout a recipient; he had simply to believe the word of God, and wait in expectation for the promised good. And there, indeed, the chief difficulty stood; for the things promised were not merely so far above the reach of any power he personally had to possess them, but so much even above the line of God's ordinary working in providence, that it seemed to the eye of reason like extravagance to believe them possible. He did believe, however, "and his faith was counted to him for righteousness," (Gen. xv. 6.)

So far all is perfectly plain, and looking thus simply at the record of God's dealings toward him, we see in Abraham a beautiful and striking exemplification of that great gospel-principle, according to which God justifies the ungodly through faith. This is the use made of it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and again at more length in the 4th chap. of the Epistle to the Romans. The promises given to Abraham were such as clearly to indicate, that he was in a justified condition, or received by God into a state of favour and acceptance. But these promises were given, when he was like other men, a sinner, nay, like his kindred, chargeable to some extent with the pollutions of idolatry; and yet, instead of calling him to work out a title by deeds of righteousness to the blessings promised, they are conferred at once, and what he has simply to do is to believe the word of promise. Faith in that word, not any righteousness of his own, nor any pretensions to it, is the sole connecting link between him and the blessings he is to inherit. And what is this but the cardinal principle on which, in the dis-

pensation of the gospel, God hangs the communication of his blessings in Christ. These blessings are entirely of his own providing, and the gift of his free grace to men. On their part nothing is to be done, either in respect to the purchase of salvation, or the acquirement of a title to the benefits it affords. They are all contemplated by God as sinners, in condemnation and ruin; and salvation can come to them no otherwise, than as the sovereign gift of God, which it is theirs merely to receive, by embracing in faith the word of promise, which makes offer of its riches. Works, therefore, are completely excluded from any share in the matter of our reconciliation with God. "We are saved, not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to the mercy of God;" and eternal life, the sum of all the blessings of salvation, is the "gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

In this manifestation of grace and mercy to the sinful, it is of course necessary, that there should be a ground of righteousness, rendering it consistent with the holiness of the divine government to confer such favour on the guilty. Were there not that, God would be found, not only indifferent to sin, but even the friend and patron of sinners as such; and the maxim, so abhorrent to a pious mind, "of sinning because grace doth abound," might justly be charged against the scheme of the gospel. There is a righteousness, however, laid as the foundation of all the free and undeserved grace, which is exhibited in the gospel to sinners,—a righteousness so glorious and complete, that God shows himself to be just, at the very time that he justifies the ungodly; and not only the mercy, but also the faithfulness and justice of God, the very attributes most opposed to the sinner's claim, are now pledged for the security of the believer's salvation, (1 John i. 9.) From the very nature of the case, this righteousness could not be man's; no such worth could possibly attach to any obedience of his, even were he able perfectly to keep the law's requirements; it must be truly and properly divine; it must be, and is, "the righteousness of God" himself, fulfilled in behalf of sinful men, by his own eternal Son. Hence the gospel is at once the glad tidings of God's grace exhibited to the guilty, and "the revelation of his righteousness unto all, and upon all them that believe." And when it ascribes so much to the mere exercise of faith, making the possession of pardon, peace, and eternal life to depend on that, it is not as if faith were in itself so pregnant with merit, that it would be a righteous thing for God to reward its exercise, even in sinful men, with such vast recompenses of blessing, but because faith has a work of such infinite excellence and worth in Christ, to receive and rest upon. So that when God justifies the ungodly through faith, it is no fiction, but a great and blessed reality, which constitutes the ground and reason of the procedure. He does not capriciously dispense with a work of righteousness, which from the very first was declared to be the only channel, through which fallen man could return to enjoy the favour and blessing of Heaven, but only takes the execution of that work into his own hand, magnifies his law to the uttermost by

the wondrous humiliation and obedience unto death of his dear Son; and thus the way of reconciliation being laid freely open for transgressors, he is ready to receive to his kingdom and glory, all who are disposed to own his work of righteousness, as the ground of their confidence and hope toward him.

But if this be the case with sinners under the gospel, if their faith is accepted for righteousness, only because it has a work of infinite efficacy and worth to embrace in Christ, must not this also have been the case with Abraham? When he believed the word of promise, and his faith was counted for righteousness, must he not in like manner have apprehended the righteousness of God, hereafter to be revealed in Christ? Yet how obscurely is Christ referred to in the word of promise, by the belief of which Abraham was said to be justified? And how hard, if not impossible, must it have been for the patriarch to draw from that promise, any clear and definite views of the Messiah's work? These questions are more easily put than answered, and it scarcely falls within the line of our present inquiry, to enter on the formal discussion of them. That simply respects the principle, on the part of man, which connects him with the condition, privileges, and hopes of an elect seed; and that this principle is faith in the word and promise of God, not any worth or excellence in man himself, the whole history of Abraham renders clear as noon-day. It is certain, besides, for we have it on the authority of Christ himself, that he saw in faith the day of Christ, rejoicing in the prospect, and must consequently have understood, more or less clearly, the purposes for which Christ was to appear. To inform his mind, and guide his views in this respect, he had not only the word of promise given individually to himself, but the aid also of all former revelations, and especially of the institution of sacrifice, which, as we have already seen, involved the prospect of a suffering Mediator. But how far the light he possessed actually carried him in these anticipations of the future, must still be to us a matter of doubtful conjecture; and whatever it was, it could not be allowed to enter into the record of his history, nor, if we could descant on it with the utmost fulness and certainty, could it have formed any part of the typical matter of this portion of sacred writ. The work of Christ's faultless and suffering obedience, which was to display the righteousness of God, and constitute the ground of a sinner's acceptance, though it might be faintly descried by the eye of faith before it was accomplished, yet remained till then in great measure a secret, and is hence called "the hidden wisdom of God," and "the mystery hid from ages and from generations," (1 Cor. ii. 7; Col. i. 26.) Nothing more, therefore, could be expected concerning it in the early promises made to Abraham, than a general and covert reference. And if by any special revelation not recorded, he obtained a clearer insight into the work of Christ, than could possibly be derived from such a reference, or from the ordinary means then furnished to the church, his distinction in that respect could not be reckoned among the typical things in his condition. For in so far as Abraham might

apprehend and rest upon the prospective work of Christ, his faith in that respect was not typical of the Christian's, but that very faith itself. It was not an exhibition of the same principle on a lower stage of development, or in reference to outward and temporal objects, but an exhibition of it in the highest sphere, in the spiritual or Christian line of things. As a believer he was, and only could be, a type of future believers, in respect to the two lines of promise,—a numerous and blessed offspring, and the inheritance of the land of Canaan,—which were the immediate objects of his faith, and in his case the peculiar tokens of divine favour. Abraham received these distinguished proofs of electing love, as gifts of free grace, having simply to embrace in faith the word of promise, that they might become his; and in like manner now, the word of blessing and promise, on which God's people are permitted to rest, as it is the offspring on God's part of sovereign grace, so on theirs it is to be received in faith, and by faith alone do they enter into the possession of its riches.

In considering, then, the transactions of Abraham's history in a typological point of view, there is no necessity, as seems generally to be imagined, for our making out the perfect identity of his faith and ours, as to the objects contemplated and realized. The real identity is to be sought in the principle, which in both cases alike connects the individual with the favour and blessing of God,—however this may be expressed, whether in outward or inward, in temporal or spiritual things; and that principle in Abraham of old, as of the children of God now, is simply and exclusively faith. The same principle was certainly possessed and manifested by Isaac, though it by no means so strikingly appeared in the transactions of his life, as it had done in those of his father. For having been so clearly marked out, even before his birth, as the child in whom the purpose and election of God were to stand, there was scarcely room in his case for any remarkable display of the principle, or for its acquiring that singular and conspicuous place, which it appeared to hold in the life of Abraham. But in the history of Jacob, it again re-appears in full magnitude, though under circumstances considerably different from those, in which it had been exercised by the father of the faithful. Jacob knew his election of God to a higher standing than Esau's; and the language which foretold this, was such as to imply that the respective positions of the two brothers was to be characteristic, not simply of two members of one family, but of two diverse families, the one only of which should attain to distinguished favour and blessing. In seeking to realize and secure the distinction for himself, Jacob was far from acting a brotherly and an honourable part. He had faith in the word of promise, and in this stood the essential difference between him and Esau, who had no faith, and no spiritual discernment to apprehend the higher things of God, but was simply a man of gaiety and pleasure, a lover of the world, and of the things of the world. The faith of Jacob, however, though it lifted him up into fellowship with God, and filled him with intense long-

ings after the peculiar manifestations of divine love, was defective in this respect, that it did not lead him to rest in childlike confidence on the faithfulness of God to verify his own word. And so, grasping at the boon before him with undue haste, he fell into the grievous error of one, seeking to compass a righteous object by unlawful means, and provoked a vengeance which imbittered much of his future life, and threatened for a time to bring him to an untimely grave. This fall of Jacob was probably permitted, and was certainly overruled for the purpose of bringing prominently out, the absolute freeness with which God confers the gifts of grace and the alone necessity of faith to connect man with these, coming as they did, to him through faith, not only in the absence of great virtues, but when stained with the guilt of flagrant sins. For when does Jacob first personally receive the assurance of God's love, and formally enter on the covenant-relation, which had been held by his father Isaac, and his grandfather Abraham? It is while reaping in bitterness of heart the fruit of his unrighteous and crooked policy,—obliged to flee from the deadly revenge of Esau, and to seek an asylum in a foreign land,—and so oppressed by feelings of remorse for what was past, so forlorn and desolate in spirit, that as one cut off from the common sympathies of men, and the pleasant intercourse of society, he could not think of presenting himself, at the close of his day's journey, in the village of Bethel, but laid himself down at the outskirts beneath the open canopy of heaven, with nothing but the naked earth for his couch, and a stone for his pillow. That moment of deepest abasement, darkness, and depression, was the very one which the Lord chose for imparting to Jacob the richest manifestations of his favour, and confirming to him the covenant made with his fathers. And why precisely that? Not, unquestionably, because the Lord looked with indifference upon the sin of Jacob, or approved of the dreadful fraud which he had practised on his aged father; but simply for the purpose of rendering it more clear and manifest, that the blessings of the covenant were wholly of grace, that the deepest guilt and unworthiness could not exclude from them, if only there was a proper feeling of abasement in the heart, and a spirit of faith to embrace the proffered goodness of Heaven. At such a time all sense of merit must have been utterly banished from the mind of Jacob, and it was not possible for him to contemplate God in any other light, than in that of a most gracious benefactor, and himself, an undeserving recipient of divine goodness.

The very nature of the method or channel of communication which was employed in the vision at that time presented to the eye of Jacob, indicated the presence, on his part, of unworthiness, and the absence of all claim but that of faith, to the blessings of the covenant. When the covenant was fully ratified with Abraham, and he walked in the dignity of his divine calling, the angels of heaven held free and familiar intercourse with him, and the Lord of heaven himself conversed with him as one converses with his friend. But when Jacob was to be received from his sin-polluted

and oppressed condition, he was made to feel as at a distance from the presence and angels of God; a ladder reaching from heaven, to the place where he lay, establishing a medium of communication between the two distant regions, on which the angels of God ascended and descended, and at the top of which the Lord appeared in person and confirmed to him the covenant. All was of God's merciful and gracious providing—the medium of communication itself, the heavenly beings who condescended to use it, and the tidings of love, by which peace was restored to his troubled bosom; and in that bosom itself there could be room only for delightful surprise, for believing wonder. When the patriarch thus saw the bed of remorse, desertion, and gloom, on which he lay, transformed as by divine magic into the presence-chamber of God, and the highest ministers of grace holding court around him, a miserable alien from his father's house, how natural for him to exclaim, "How dreadful is this place! Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not." More than at any other period of his history, he must have felt "unworthy of all the mercy and the truth which the Lord was showing to him;" and never could a soul have been more ready to confess, that what now so vastly distinguished him from others, was entirely "of grace through faith."

This is one of the leading ideas symbolized by the action in Jacob's vision. It spake of a fellowship between heaven and earth, between the holy beings who minister in God's presence and sinful men, when they become children of the covenant; but a fellowship so maintained, as clearly to imply, that it was the very reverse of being due to man's desert, that it was the result of sovereign grace, prevailing over man's unworthiness, and requiring merely faith in him to receive the goodness so freely vouchsafed. The same idea is brought out in the reference made by our Lord to this vision, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man." He places himself in the condition of the ladder that appeared to Jacob, and asserts himself to be really what that ladder was symbolically, the true medium of communication between the region of God's presence and the tabernacles of sinful men. And that such a mediator should be needed to open heaven, and replace men within the bosom of God's elect and blessed family, bespoke in the most significant manner, the guilty and alienated condition of men by nature, their utter impotence to recover, as of themselves, the honours they had lost, and the impossibility of their obtaining an interest in the blessings of the everlasting covenant, any otherwise than through faith in the unspeakable gift of God.

How precious, then, is faith as a principle in God's spiritual government! And how infinitely important to have it really formed in the hearts of men! Other things are necessary afterwards, but this at the very outset, and the whole building of a work of grace in the soul, and of a redeemed church in the world, waits on faith as its only foundation. "As many as received Christ, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe

on his name." Interest in him brings with it the powers of a divine birth; it is the starting-point of a new and higher existence; wherever it is found, there is the arm of Omnipotence, creating out of a lost and ruined creature a child of God. And with whom is it found? With those who believe in Christ, in faith receiving his testimony, and resting on his name. Faith, therefore, is all-important at this stage of the sinner's history: for it is the taking of the one and only remedy which is able to save him from perdition, and to establish him in the sure possession of life everlasting. It finds him, so to speak, standing without, naked, forlorn, destitute, ready to perish, and leads him, as with an angel's hand, into the house, the very house of God, and sets him down there in peace and safety with the children of the household. The moment faith takes possession of his soul, and he receives Christ as "the Lord his righteousness," he has found, what he could nowhere else have found, a badge and passport to carry him from the condemnation of sin, to the security and blessedness of salvation. But until he exercises this faith in Christ, he is still of necessity in the condition of the lost, a child of wrath, and an heir of perdition. And to mind other things, while still this one thing needful is neglected—to attend to other requirements of the gospel, while this prime and fundamental requirement is not complied with, however commonly done, is to act no wiser a part than is taken by him who chiefly concerns himself about the decorating of his person, or the dressing of his food, while disease and death are left unchecked to do their work upon his body.

It were well, if this relative, and we might say, exclusive, importance of faith at the threshold of a Christian life, as that which alone can enable the sinner to bridge the awful gulf that naturally separates him from God, were kept distinctly and properly in view by all who profess to instruct their fellow-men in the things of God. For when it is otherwise, not only are endless confusions, and grievous, if not fatal mistakes in doctrine certain to arise, but the whole fruit that should grow out of the means and offers of salvation is likely to be lost. The fit and proper expression of a pastor's heart in this respect, is the tender sentiment uttered by the apostle toward the Galatians, "My little children, of whom I travail in birth, until Christ be formed in you." For so long as this remains undone, the first breathings of life are not yet in their hearts, and the little reformations that may otherwise be effected, are utterly powerless to reach the main cause of the evil, and produce any substantial change on their future destiny. To be concerned about these minor points, while the great and fundamental point of an interest in Christ is neglected, is like cutting off a limb to cure a diseased heart, or setting up a cope-stone on a decayed and bowing wall; to do what may be done, while the evil continues in its root and principle untouched. That evil can be thoroughly reached and properly rectified only by a believing application to Christ, which being done, other things follow as a matter of course; the tree has become good, and its fruit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth.

Viewed thus in a practical light, the truth of salvation simply by faith, faith resting on Christ Jesus, is of unspeakable magnitude and importance. And it will still more manifestly appear to be so, if considered in its bearing on the vital question of the sinner's warrant and encouragement to come to Christ, and to trust in him for salvation. For it is only when an interest in God's favour and blessing is offered to the sinner as God's absolute gift in Jesus Christ, and as a gift needing simply to be received in faith to become his, that all stumbling-blocks are removed out of the way of a sinner's approach to him, and that a salvation, truly and properly free, is brought to the sinner's acceptance. In this case, and in this alone, is he entitled to look entirely out of himself for his warrant to come to God; the invitation and promise are addressed to him as a sinner, who neither possesses, nor needs any qualification in himself to get the offered salvation; as in the case of Abraham, it comes from above to his hand, and all he has to do is to receive the gift. "I make no question, but before a sinner will come to Christ by believing, he must be an awakened, convinced, sensible sinner; pricked in his heart with a sense of his sin and misery; made to groan under his burden, to despair of relief from the law itself, and to desire and thirst after Christ and his righteousness. And therefore the law must be preached by all those who would preach Christ aright. But that these, or any other things in the sinner, are required to warrant him that he may come to Christ by believing, is what I conceive the Scripture teaches not; but the general offer of the gospel warrants every man to come. And in practice it will be found, that the requiring of such and such qualifications in sinners to warrant them to believe in Christ, is no great help to them in their way towards him; forasmuch as it engages them in a doubtful disputation as to the being, kind, measure, and degree of their qualifications for coming to Christ; the time spent in which might be better improved in their going forward to Christ for all, by believing. And since no man can ever believe in Christ, without knowing that he has a warrant for believing in him, otherwise he can but act presumptuously; to tell sinners that none may come to Christ, or have warrant to believe, but such as have a true repentance, must needs, in a special manner, entangle distressed consciences, so as they dare not believe, until they know their repentance to be true repentance. For, however much they hear of Christ and his salvation offered in the gospel, these will be to them as forbidden fruit, which they are not allowed to touch, till once they are persuaded that they have true repentance. So that, one would think, the suggesting of this principle is but a bad office done to a soul brought to 'the place of the breaking forth of children.' Let no man say, that arguing at this rate, one must know also the truth of his faith, before he can come to Christ; for faith is not a qualification for coming to Christ, but the coming itself, which will have its saving effects on the sinner, whether he knows the truth of it or not."*

* Boston's Notes on Marrow of Modern Divinity, P. I. c. 2.

Or, let us hear the doctrine more experimentally stated and applied by the great Reformer: "Faith, therefore, embraceth and wrappeth in itself Christ Jesus, the Son of God, delivered to death for us, who being apprehended by faith, giveth unto us righteousness and life. Christ is no Moses, no exactor, no giver of laws, but a giver of grace, a Saviour, and one that is full of mercy; briefly, he is nothing else but infinite mercy and goodness, freely given, and bountifully giving unto us. And thus shall you paint out Christ in his true colours. If you suffer him to be any otherwise painted out to you, when temptation and trouble come, you shall soon be overthrown. I say not this for naught, for I have oftentimes proved by experience, and I daily find what a hard matter it is to believe, especially in the conflict of conscience, that Christ was given, not for the holy, righteous, worthy, and such as were his friends, but for wicked sinners, for the unworthy, and for his enemies, which have deserved God's wrath and everlasting death. Let us, therefore, arm ourselves with these and such like sentences of Scripture, that we may be able to answer the devil (accusing us, and saying, Thou art a sinner, and therefore thou art damned,) in this sort: Because thou sayest, I am a sinner, therefore will I be righteous and saved. Nay, saith the devil, Thou shalt be condemned. No, say I, for I flee unto Christ, who hath given himself for my sins; therefore, Satan, thou shalt not prevail against me, in that thou goest about to terrify me, in setting forth the greatness of my sins, and so wouldst bring me into heaviness, distrust, despair, hatred, contempt, and blaspheming of God. Yea, rather in that thou sayest I am a sinner, thou givest me armour and weapon against thyself, that with thine own sword I may cut thy throat, and tread thee under my feet; for Christ died for sinners. Moreover, thou thyself preachest unto me the glory of God, for thou puttest me in mind of God's fatherly love towards me, wretched and lost sinner, who 'so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.' "*

The wonderful and gracious manner in which God has thus simplified the way of salvation to sinners, discharging them from the necessity of bringing any personal qualifications, and narrowing the ground of their acceptance by him, to the single point of their receiving in faith his own freely offered gift, while it is fraught with all possible encouragement to humble and sincere inquirers, at the same time leaves without excuse those who do not heartily believe in Christ, and who neglect the great salvation. Of them it may be said, in the language of Christ himself, addressed to the Jews: "If he had not come and spoken to them, (inviting them with so much tenderness, and unfolding to them terms of such marvellous grace,) they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." In his sight, that is, in the judgment and reckoning of God, the not receiving, or believing in, an offered

* On Galatians, pp. 23, 152. English Trans.

Saviour, is immeasurably more and greater than every other sin; it carries, so to speak, all guilt in its bosom; and is fraught, as nothing else can be, with the elements of perdition. Sin of the deepest die cleaves to such persons, and they have no cloak for it. Had they but received him, they had been furnished with a cloak which would have covered all; the garment of his salvation, put on by faith, would have enabled them to stand unabashed, yea, with holy boldness and rejoicing, before the eye of Omniscience itself, owned, accepted, and blest. But having rejected this rich provision of undeserved grace, though presented to them so that it was theirs merely for the taking, as their guilt is now without excuse, so their condemnation must be without any thing to relieve, with every thing to aggravate its horrors.

SECTION FIFTH.

THE FRUIT OF FAITH A RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH DISTINGUISHES BELIEVERS FROM THE WORLD, AND MAKES THEM SUBJECTS OF REWARD.

1. We have seen that when the election of God comes down and manifests itself, as it must necessarily do, in something personal to those who are the subjects of it, and essentially distinguishing them from others, faith is the cardinal principle in which the distinction appears and develops itself. But faith itself must come down to the floor of every-day life, and there prove its reality and its worth, as the link of connexion between man and God, and in man the root-principle of a divine nature, by the upright, pure and spiritual conduct, which it leads those who have it to maintain amid the vanities and corruptions of the world. For if in the things which concern the regular worship and service of God, it might appear that they were nothing the better for their participation in the gifts of grace, and in their lives were not practically elevated above other men, it would be impossible to assign any adequate reason for the singular and pre-eminent rank held by faith in the government of God, or to vindicate his opposite procedure toward men, according as they possess or want faith, from the charge of caprice. That those who were chosen to the enjoyment of his favour and blessing, should not have been chosen on account of any desert in themselves, but as altogether undeserving of the boon, and unable of themselves to earn it, should have simply received it through faith in the testimony of God, is no more than what we might have expected, and the nature of the case, indeed, rendered necessary. But we are equally warranted and constrained to expect, that after they have thus become partakers of the heavenly gift, they should be found standing visibly out from the mass of unbelieving men, and pursuing a course which might justify them in looking for very different treatment at the hands of God. For God must show himself to be a holy, at the same time that he acts as a gracious being; grace as a principle in his government must be found reigning unto righteousness, as well as to salvation; and he could be justified, when he is judged, for making so peculiar an account of faith in the management of his kingdom,

only if this faith should appear in the lives of those who possessed it to be a root of spiritual life in the heart, yielding the peaceable fruits of righteousness.

Now, from the earliest times we find the distinction between believers, as God's chosen seed, and the rest of the world, running out and manifesting itself in their comparatively pure and spotless lives. Faith in Abel vindicated its superiority over unbelief in Cain, by the works of the former being righteous, while those of the latter were evil, (1 John iii. 12.) In Enoch faith led him to walk so as to please God, (Heb. xi. 5;) and in Noah it appeared as the source of a righteousness which kept him aloof from the corruptions that overspread the whole earth, and is even said to have made him "perfect in his generations," (Gen. vi. 9.) It is clear, that the men of faith in the antediluvian period of the world's history were the salt of the earth, and that it was simply from the salt having lost its savour, in consequence of the decay of faith, that the Lord resolved to put an end to his forbearance, and treat that race of transgressors as the generation of his wrath. But as Abraham stands pre-eminent among all who lived in patriarchal times for the possession and exercise of faith, we may with greatest propriety select his case for an illustration of the fruitfulness of faith, and the rewardableness of the works of which it is productive. It is true, that he had no special and laborious services to perform, as the chosen servant of God. He had to wait, rather than to work. But patience to wait so long, and in regard to objects so far above the thought and expectations of nature, is itself one of the most trying and difficult exercises of gracious principle, and argues a soul ripe for obedience to the highest commands of Heaven. And as this patient waiting for a long period of his life might be called Abraham's special work, it shone forth as altogether the fruit of faith, springing from his firm confidence in the faithful promises of God. His faith on one occasion partially failed, when, despairing of the fulfilment of the promise concerning a numerous seed through his proper spouse Sarah, he admitted to his bed the Egyptian bondmaid, and thus became a transgressor in regard to the comely order and discipline of families. This itself was a testimony to the moral tendency of faith, seeing that it no sooner failed, than the failure discovered itself in a departure from the path of uprightness. For this defection from righteous principle he was first chastised by the contentions which were permitted to spring up in his family, and afterwards was directly reproved when the Lord came to assure him of the proper fulfilment of the promise by Sarah. Appearing then to renew the intercourse which had been long suspended, the Lord began by addressing to him these words of admonition; "I am the Almighty God, walk before me, and be thou perfect," or upright, (Gen. xvii. 1;) as much as to say: Remember who it is that has given thee the promise of a numerous offspring—not one confined, like thyself, in his manner of working to the ordinary laws of nature, but one who has omnipotence at command to reach his ends by whatever means he is pleased to adopt,—and, therefore, it ill becomes thee as my peculiar servant,

my representative and witness on earth, (Gen. xx. 7,) and betokens an imperfect apprehension of my true character, to resort to any sinister devices for helping out the execution of my revealed will. Leave that to me, as the Almighty God, to whom nothing is impossible, and let it be thy part to proceed with unfaltering step along the path of uprightness and purity.

That Abraham declined very rarely from this path, and was eminently righteous in his walk, may be inferred, not only from there being so little recorded against him of an opposite nature, but also from the generally consistent manner in which he went through the peculiar course of trial assigned him, and pre-eminently from that crowning act of obedience, the offering up of his son Isaac, which had been impossible for him, unless the highest principles of a righteous life had already been firmly established in his heart, and kept in lively exercise. Such a singular and unparalleled surrender of all selfish feelings and natural affections to the will of God, serves like an index to proclaim how complete was the mastery he had gained over the corrupt will of the flesh, and how profound the spirit of reverence and submission he habitually cherished to the authority of Heaven. But this ripened display of holiness in Abraham was nothing more than the highest exercise and triumph of faith. It was not merely connected with his faith in the word of promise, and went along with that as a sort of fitting accompaniment, but it directly sprang from faith, and without faith could have had no existence. This faith it was, which removed the mountains that rose up before him, when God commanded the painful sacrifice, and made the path of duty, otherwise impracticable, comparatively smooth and easy. For faith, resting in firm confidence upon the word of promise, which assured him not only of a numerous seed, but that in Isaac the seed should be called, and taught by past experience to believe even in natural impossibilities, such faith enabled him to see light, where all had otherwise been darkness, to hope while in the very act of destroying the great object of his hope. I know—he must have said within himself—I know and am persuaded, that the word of God shall stand fast, whatever may seem for a time to bring its faithfulness into doubt, and though to stretch forth my hand against this child of promise is not more painful to my own feeling, than apparently destructive to the truth of God, yet I may safely do it, when he commands it, who gave the promise; it is as easy for the Almighty arm of Jehovah to recover my son from the stroke of death, as it was at first to bring him into being from the dead womb of Sarah. Thus, what was Abraham's sublimest act of obedience was at the same time his highest exercise of faith; the one was the divine seed in the heart, the other the glorious harvest of righteousness, which it yielded in the life; and it was simply because the quickening principle had struck its roots so firmly within, that the outward fruit was so rich and beautiful.*

* It is only in this point of view that we contemplate the act of Abraham in offering up Isaac—as a trial to his faith, and in the result a sublime manifestation of

The whole life of Abraham, then, from the period of his call in Mesopotamia to this crowning act of obedience in offering up his son Isaac, was a striking testimony to the high moral worth, which

the higher principles of a divine life. This was its real and proper character, and in that alone, not in something else, we must seek its typical import. It showed in a way every heart must feel, to how noble a height faith in a word of God might carry the believer, and how, as the principle of faith attains to more strength, the conduct advances toward perfection. Warburton, as is well known, considers the transaction as a scenical representation of the death and resurrection of Christ, given at the earnest request of Abraham, who longed impatiently to see Christ's day; Isaac's being brought to the mount, bound and laid upon the altar, figuring the death and sufferings of Christ, and his being taken from thence, as properly figuring Christ's resurrection from the dead. (Divine Legation, B. vi. sec. 5.) Graves calls this fanciful and utterly groundless conceit, "a just and ingenious explanation," and only employs it as an argument to disprove Warburton's own views concerning the ignorance of the older Jews regarding a future life. It is substantially adopted also by the pious, though loose and rhetorical Blunt, in his Hulsean Lectures for 1832, who calls it "a prophetic action, designed by God to unfold his purposes more fully, a living book in which his will was written, a rehearsal, as it were, of the atonement on the cross," p. 57. Of course this view proceeds on the supposition, that the transactions themselves connected with the offering up of Isaac, were, according to the more common notion, fitted to give a typical representation of the death and resurrection of Christ, and builds on this the farther supposition, that they were merely and exclusively ordered for conveying information to Abraham respecting these coming events. So that if the action could not be a typical one, much less could it be a scenical representation or a prophetical action in the Warburton sense. But with what truth or propriety can the offering up of Isaac be regarded as typical of the sacrifice of Christ, when the two actions are so utterly and palpably at variance in their leading and distinctive peculiarities? It is nothing to the purpose, that many minor points of resemblance may be discovered; (and these are generally swelled out by the addition of things, which have no real, or at least certain existence, as that "the land of Moriah," mentioned in Gen. xxii. 1, was the same with the mount of that name on which the temple was built, and which was a small portion of Mount Zion, and that Calvary where Christ was crucified belonged to it, which is plainly impossible;) for it was the shedding of blood that mainly rendered the sacrificial victims typical of Christ's death, and that is precisely the thing which is wanting here; we see the willing and devoted surrender of a loved object, but still no sacrifice, because no shedding of blood. Nay, if there had been this,—even if Isaac had been actually put to death, what then? Would his death have really possessed the character of an atoning sacrifice? The supposition is monstrous,—one sinful being offered up to expiate the guilt of another!—and instead of predisposing men to take in the proper notion of atonement, could only have served to lead them farther from it. Human victims, themselves personally defiled, were abhorrent to that notion, and consequently were prohibited in every form. No doubt, the slaying of Isaac is called by God a burnt-offering, and had the act been carried into effect, it must have had the character of a sacrifice. But so far from this proving what was really done to possess that character, it only proves that the command to put Isaac to death as a sacrifice, was one of the most staggering things in the trial, appearing as it must have done, and that always the more, the clearer Abraham's views of God were, utterly irreconcilable to the divine character, to require such a victim. The more it ran counter to his ideas concerning God, the more did it put faith on the stretch,—but the less also could God either intend, or permit it to proceed to the full consummation. From the transaction as it actually took place, and is recorded in the book of Genesis, no Jew could have imbibed one essential element of the true doctrine of an atoning Messiah, or derived any ground for expecting such an event as the great redemption. It is a remarkable proof of this, that when the modern Jews began to think of the offering of Isaac, as possessing somewhat of the character of an atonement, (the older ones, we take it, never dreamt of any thing of the kind,) they attributed great virtue to the bending and binding of Isaac for the pardon of sin, and in their prayers on the day of atonement, they entreated God to remember the binding of Isaac upon the altar, and to blot out their iniquities, (Vorstius Animad. in Pirke R. Eliezer, p. 209.) What else could they think of, indeed? There was no blood in the case, and if there was any atoning virtue, it must have been in the binding, the nearest thing to it. It may justly be affirmed, therefore, of the idea in question that it sets at naught all sound principles of typical interpretation. The history concentrates our view on

God expects from his people, and the necessary connexion between this and faith, as between the effect and its cause. Such was the love, which breathed in his heart toward God, that at God's bidding he willingly renounced the endearments of his father's house, encountered the troubles of an unsettled and wandering life, and at last laid the object of all his hopes as a doomed victim on the altar. And the love which flowed out into such a self-denying course of obedience, was itself the offspring of faith; for he first believed, and then did; first embraced the promise, and in that found encouragement and strength to fulfil the command. If the manner in which he was received to an interest in the divine favour proclaimed beforehand the principle of salvation by faith, his behaviour afterwards equally established this other principle, that faith worketh by love, and that, so far from making light of God's commandments, it will stagger at no sacrifice or difficulty in obeying them. In his call he was not more a monument of the grace of God, than in his after-life he was a witness of the holiness of God.

The things which concern the type tread here so closely upon those which belong to the antitype, that it is scarcely possible to draw any exact line of distinction between them. In every age, and under every dispensation, holiness must be the distinguishing characteristic of the people of God; and that holiness being the reflection of God's own pure and blessed character, as opposed to the vanities and corruptions of a sinful world, its manifestations in one period of the world's history cannot be materially different from those which are required in another. But if Abraham's faith in the promise of a numerous seed, and an earthly Canaan, exercised such a purifying and ennobling influence over his heart and conduct, how much more must the higher and more animating prospects, opened up to the faith of the Christian, produce, and be attested by like fruits in him! He cannot in reality be a child of Abraham, possessing this faith, without giving clear evidence of it in the same weaned heart and pilgrim-life,—the same meek and reverent regard to the authority of God,—the same withdrawal from the corruptions of the world,—the same readiness to go wherever the voice of Heaven calls, and to yield at the Divine bidding, the objects which nature most fondly loves and clings to. Faith looks to the cross of Calvary, and while it says, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ," it enters into the condemnation of sin and nature there experienced, and adds, "by which I am crucified to the world, and the world is crucified to me." Faith apprehends the holy ends for which an atoning Saviour has been provided, and says, "What have I to do any more with idols?" I am now no longer my own,

what Abraham did and gave, not on what Isaac suffered, or was on the point of suffering; the command was given simply for the purpose of tempting Abraham, or putting him to the test, and his obedience was a proof, the noblest proof in Old Testament scripture, how "faith worketh by love," and in its working can surmount all obstacles, and sacrifice all natural delights.

but a temple of the living God, and his temple is holy. Faith surveys the difficulties and trials connected with a Christian life, and grounding itself in the divine sufficiency of Christ, it exclaims with humble confidence, "I can do all things through Christ strengthening me." And realizing, as it does, for its final home, a kingdom into which nothing that defileth can enter, a sanctuary where every object, occupation, and enjoyment, is stamped with holiness, faith should belie its own nature, and slight the very end it is bent on attaining, if it did not lead those under its control, to war a good warfare against corruption, and to seek to be pure as Christ is pure.

Thus are the hearts of Christ's people "purified by faith;" and as there is no other fountain-head of life and holiness but this, no other means through which righteousness is attainable to fallen man, so believers, and they alone, are the lights of the world—in them, but in none besides, is there any proper reflection of the character of Godhead. So that if the messengers of grace must go forth with their tidings of salvation in the spirit of the Psalmist, "We believe, and therefore speak;" the partakers of grace must be ready to reply, "We believe, and therefore love and obey." And the more clear and lively their faith, the more fixed and determinate will always be their purpose to live obedient to the will, and devoted to the glory of their divine Master. It is in the nature of things impossible, that the soul, which clings with realizing confidence to him as its Saviour, should take pleasure in the things which he abhors, or should cease to delight running the way of his commandments. It must ever breathe the sentiment expressed by the pious reformer, "If any man ask me why I work, seeing that faith justifieth me, I answer, love compelleth me; for as long as my soul feeleth with what love God hath loved me in Christ, I cannot but love God again, and his will, and commandments, and of love work them, nor can they seem hard to me."

This practical working of faith to all becoming exercises of love and holiness, is not less necessary to render the method of salvation by Jesus Christ worthy of God, than its justifying property in bringing to us an interest in the favour and blessing of God. For by this method of salvation two ends were to be secured, alike important and necessary: the first, that all its blessings should be offered freely to our acceptance, offered to us simply as sinners, without respect to worth or merit in ourselves, that so, none might be excluded, and God might have all the glory; the second, that the reception of gospel blessings might draw with it a sanctifying effect, so as to prevent the possibility of divine grace being turned, except by fraudulent perversion, into a handle for licentiousness. Were these two ends kept steadily in view, as alike necessary to be secured, the doctrine of the cross would cease to be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, excepting in the case of those whose hearts are hardened by the deceitfulness of sin, and who handle deceitfully the grace of God.

2. The fact, however, that faith is a sanctifying principle, and

that it invariably discovers itself, wherever it truly exists, in such works of righteousness as render those who possess it the lights of the world, is only the first branch of this subject. And the second is, that the works of righteousness such persons do perform, are rewardable; they shall be crowned with God's approbation and blessing. This appears also with peculiar prominence in the history of Abraham. For immediately after he had proved his willingness to obey the voice of God even to the offering up of Isaac, the Lord said to him, "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord; for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed, as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand, which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." (Gen. xxii. 16—18.) Here, first, we see in regard to the things promised, that they are precisely the things which God had already of his own mercy and goodness pledged his word in covenant to bestow upon Abraham; these, indeed, to their largest extent, but still no more, no other than these—a seed numerous like the sand upon the sea-shore, or the stars of heaven, securely defended against the power and malice of its enemies, peculiarly blessed in itself, and constituted the channel of blessing to all others. But secondly, we see, that while the same promises of good are renewed, they are now connected with Abraham's surrender to the will of God, and are confirmed to him as a portion of blessing for the reward of his obedience. To bring this more distinctly and prominently out, it is stated both at the commencement and close of the address: "Because thou hast done this . . . . because thou hast obeyed my voice." There was here, beyond all question, recognised and established a very close connexion between Abraham's devoted obedience to the will of God, and the inheritance of blessing he was to obtain. And yet, as if expressly to guard against his supposing this inheritance to have been properly earned and procured by his obedience, it is represented, down even to the words and similitudes employed in describing it, as consisting in what had been promised from the very first, before there was room for obedience. The only thing superadded, as the result of this lofty exercise of righteous principle, is the oath of God confirming the promise, and rendering it, though not in itself more sure of fulfilment, yet more evidently and palpably so in the apprehension of the heirs of promise.

There is certainly no portion of patriarchal history, in which this principle is so fully and broadly declared; but there are others in which we clearly enough see it to have been acted on. In particular, it is scarcely possible to read what is written of Enoch, Noah, and especially of Joseph, without feeling persuaded, that the singular tokens of divine favour conferred, were essentially connected with the distinguished worth of the individuals, and for a recompense of the same. And if we come down to later times, to

the age, for example, of David, we find the principle at once manifestly acted on and unhesitatingly announced: as when the Psalmist, recounting the Lord's dealings with him during the long conflict he had to maintain with his adversaries, joins with his celebrations of the Lord's mercy and goodness, such declarations as, "I was also upright before him, and I kept myself from mine iniquity; therefore hath the Lord recompensed me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands in his eyesight," (Ps. xviii. 23, 24.)

When we turn to the higher, the spiritual and eternal things of the gospel, we find precisely the same order established—the same connexion between the deeds of a righteous life, and the inheritance of promised blessing hereafter. But if we look into the representations given of the whole subject with any measure of careful discrimination, we shall find, that exactly as in the case of Abraham, the connexion is of such a nature as to afford no ground for self-righteous confidence or boasting, while it provides the utmost encouragement to exertion in the works of righteousness.

(1.) For, in the first instance, the believer's sure and only title, properly so called, to all blessing either in time or eternity, is conferred upon him the moment he receives the grace of an offered Saviour, in virtue simply of his connexion with that Saviour, and consequently without the least desert of good on his own part. We need go no farther, in proof of this, than to the two parables of the lost sheep and the prodigal son; for there admission to all the peace, comforts, and blessings of salvation, is represented as immediately consequent on the sinner's return from his wanderings to fellowship with Christ. The case, also, of the penitent malefactor is an undoubted exemplification of it; for though to the last hour of his mortal existence he is known to us only as a doer of evil, he received, in answer to his prayer of faith, the assurance of an almost instant reception to the glories of paradise. And what, indeed, is the word of promise to every believing penitent? "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath everlasting life." "This is the record of God, that he hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." *Salvation, eternal life*, are both alike comprehensive of all that can be enjoyed of blessing and glory by the redeemed, whether in this life, or in the life that is to come. But these become, we are assured, the portion of those, who, however sinful in themselves, believe in childlike confidence upon Christ; and being thus "accepted in the Beloved," made heirs of all things simply because they have become his, and called to rejoice through him, as soon as they believe, in the hope of the glory of God, boasting in every form and degree is cut off at the very threshold of a Christian life; the whole inheritance is seen to be of grace, and constantly as the believer receives into his bosom the good things provided for him, the feelings of his heart must prompt him to raise the shout of thanksgiving, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but to thy name give glory."

(2.) It is perfectly compatible with this doctrine concerning the free gift of salvation with all its present and eternal blessings, and is, indeed, its natural and necessary consequence, that God should not only require, but also approve and bless the upright and pious behaviour of those, who have become partakers of salvation. For the same principle, which disposes him to love righteousness in his Son, and to count it an offering of such sweet-smelling savour, that for its sake he will grant eternal life to as many as believe, must also dispose him to love every exercise of righteous affection on the part of those, who have believed, and to testify toward it his favour and approval. What are the believer's gifts and graces but streams from the fountain of Christ's fulness, or partial manifestations of the divine life that is in him? And if, as it exists in Christ, this life is regarded as infinitely precious and rewardable, how can it fail to be so in measure when discovering itself in the conduct of Christ's people? Their interest through faith in the all-prevailing righteousness of Christ, has been accepted to the deliverance of their persons from the justly deserved sentence of condemnation, and their recovery from the condition of outcasts to the bosom of God's blessed family; and the same interest surely must provide for the acceptance of the deeds of righteousness they practise, as members of Christ's body and subjects of his implanted grace. To act thus toward them, is just to carry out the principle of union to a divinely-constituted head, which lies at the foundation of the whole dispensation of grace; according to which the many are received to favour and blessing in the one,—the many sinful for the one righteous in whom they stand, the imperfect services of the justified because of the infinite worth of the one perfect obedience, out of which they grow as their living root. Hence, since all good in the faithful is but the "manifestation of the life of Christ," ("nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me,") or an exercise of the grace and Spirit of Christ, it is viewed by God as the proper subject of approbation and blessing, on account of Christ himself being so. "Their spiritual sacrifices are acceptable to God," but only "by Jesus Christ," and "through him" also are the things which they do, by divine grace, rendered "well-pleasing in the sight of God." So that all must be done in his name, and presented to the Father as the fruit of their interest in his redemption. (2 Cor. iv. 10, Gal. ii. 20, Phil. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, Col. iii. 17.) Here again, the gospel-system cuts off all ground of merit or self-righteous boasting in men. It not only does so at the threshold, by stripping them of every personal title to God's favour, and declaring their only ground of justification before him to be in the "free grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ;" but even after they have thus been accepted in their persons, it represents their services to be no further owned as good, and crowned with blessing, than as they are the offspring of Christ's indwelling grace, and presented in humble confidence upon his mediation. Whatever blessing God may be pleased to confer upon them either here or hereafter, the praise must still be ascribed

"to the glory of his grace;" and no one could convert such a method of procedure into an occasion for the nourishment of self-complacency and pride, unless he had first lost sight of the essential principles of the gospel, and the real nature of a Christian's calling. Nay, the thought, that he stands in such close fellowship with Christ, and has free access in him to the whole fulness of the Godhead, must fill him with abasement, at the very time he is receiving, or doing what shall receive the divine approbation, that he has done no more; even when he has done most, he must feel that, viewed in connexion with so high a standing and so bountiful a Master, he is still an unprofitable servant. But, on the other hand, what a noble encouragement for his abounding to the uttermost in every good word and work! Just because his righteousness is so closely connected with Christ's, and is, so to speak, a filling up of that which was behind in the revenue of glory, which Christ's work was to bring to the Godhead, he may the more confidently reckon upon its meeting with a due recompense of reward. He may rest assured, as Scripture does assure him, that what has so divine an origin, and is so essentially connected with the highest purposes of Godhead, will neither be slighted nor forgotten; all shall be kept in faithful remembrance, from the highest acts of martyrdom down to the giving of a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple; and every one, who has truly joined himself in faith to Christ, shall receive even as his deeds have been. (Mat. x. 42; 1 Cor. iii. 8; Eph. vi. 8; Mal. iii. 16—18.)

(3.) The securing of this twofold object by the gospel method of reward, becomes still more evidently that, which is aimed at on the part of God, and which must be fulfilled in those who are genuine believers, when we consider what the reward promised actually is. As in the case of Abraham, it is precisely what had been already conferred in free and sovereign grace. While we are told, that every man shall receive according to his works, or, that as he has sown, so shall he reap, we are told at the same time, that the good to be received or reaped, is that very portion of blessing and glory which Christ has provided for his people. "He that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." "To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." "He that endureth to the end shall be saved." "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." (Gal. vi. 8; Rev. ii. 7; Mark xiii. 13; Matth. xxv. 21.) Salvation, everlasting life, admission into the paradise of God, and the inheritance of its endless joys, are here as inseparably coupled with the believer's faithful and devoted application to the service of God, made as dependent upon that, as, in the passages formerly quoted, they were distinctly referred to the free and undeserved grace of God. Such being the case, it is obvious, that the believer has no ground or warrant for regarding himself as in any proper sense the maker of his own fortune. The inheritance has been purchased for him by another, and was his by the free grant of Heaven, before he had performed *any* work of

righteousness in reference to it. And whatever influence the services he afterwards renders to the cause of righteousness may have upon his share in the inheritance, he never can in reason cherish the idea, that those services are either to purchase the inheritance itself, or lay the foundation of his own title to possess it. Though he were able to say with the apostle Paul, "I have laboured more than all the apostles," he could no more be entitled to add, "I have thereby procured for myself a portion of blessedness throughout eternity," than Abraham, after the offering up of Isaac, would have been warranted to affirm, that he had earned by his righteous conduct a title to the blessing of a numerous offspring, and a sure establishment for them in the land of Canaan.

What, then, it may be asked, is either the one or the other the better for his deeds of righteousness? If the inheritance is sure at any rate, the gift of grace, both without and before any working on the part of the believer, why connect it afterwards with his working? Or what precisely is the benefit which this working is to bring to him in the matter? There is a twofold benefit, one present, and the other future, furnishing a twofold ground for the connexion between the objects in question. In the first place, the believer's deeds of righteousness ascertain him of the reality of his interest in the promised inheritance, and that, of course, always the more, the greater in number, and the higher in character these deeds of righteousness are. It is true that in his case, as well as Abraham's, he may confidently reckon on the promised good, from the time that the word of promise receives a place in his bosom; the moment "he has access by faith into the grace wherein he stands," he both may and ought to "rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. v. 2.) But it is not the less true that this hope is capable of receiving much confirmation and stability from the progress he afterwards makes in the walk and labours of a Christian life; though not more sure in itself, it may become much more sure and settled in his apprehension, as supplying him with a well-grounded expectation of good things to come; because he can then discern in himself the present fruits of divine grace, and as one who has received in part, may joyfully anticipate that the whole shall certainly be brought to his possession. Hence, the apostle, immediately after he has spoken of the believer as rejoicing in the hope of God's glory, whenever he had obtained access by faith into the privileges of grace, represents the same hope as the fruit of the believer's experience in the divine life; "experience (worketh) hope, and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost," (Rom. v. 4, 5,) —that is, it is thus proved and evidenced to be, not a false or uncertain, but a true, heavenly, and settled principle. Hence, also, the apostle could say of himself, at the close of his labours, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day;" (2 Tim. iv. 7, 8,) evidently meaning, not that he had by his

life of hard labour and unwearied devotedness to the cause of Christ wrought out his title to that glorious crown, but that divine grace having carried him successfully through the period of trial and difficulty, he could confidently reckon on its safely landing him in the mansions of rest and glory; the same mercy and fatihfulness, which had enabled him to finish the labour, would assuredly present him with the crown. This is the attainment of a full and ripened assurance, a high and blessed attainment, and one that can only be reached through a fruitful application to the work of God, and a matured experience in the divine life. And were this all that the believer could obtain by labouring in the deeds of righteousness, it is in itself so rich a treasure, that it might well prompt him to be "steadfast, immovable, and always abounding in the work of the Lord."

But this is far from being all. In addition to the present good thus to be obtained by the believer's fruitfulness in the service of God, there is another and future one. For though his acts and exercises of grace cannot purchase either the inheritance itself of everlasting life, or his title to enjoy it, they shall yet determine the extent, to which he shall share in its blessings and glories. Every child of faith is, doubtless, an heir of promise—an heir of God, and a joint-heir with Christ. But not an heir in the same degree, and in respect to the same amount of future good. For the coming world of glory is placed in such a close and intimate connexion with this present world of labour and trial, that every manifestation of holy principle in the one, is destined to have its corresponding recompense of honour and blessing in the other. Accordingly, the rule expressly laid down in Scripture, and confirmed in many collateral passages, is, that "he who soweth (to the Spirit) sparingly, shall reap also sparingly, and he who soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully." (2 Cor. ix. 6; Matth. xxv. 21, sq; Luke xii. 41—44; Dan. xii. 3.) It is difficult, and indeed impossible for us, in our present state of ignorance and imperfection, to understand in all respects how this rule is to be carried out; and especially how those, who have been less diligent and fruitful than others in the service of God on earth, shall enjoy their diminished portion of good without any feeling of uneasiness, on a comparison of themselves with such as have done and obtained more. But matters of this description, which are still mysteries of the kingdom, may safely be left with him on whose shoulder is the government of the future, as well as the present world, to order and to establish it. And to say nothing of several other ways, in which it is conceivable that the deeds of righteousness performed here, may contribute to the amount of good enjoyed hereafter,—such as the happy recollection of a well-spent life, or the consciousness of having done our part to promote the glory of God, and bring others to heaven; we can have no difficulty in apprehending at least one leading respect, in which the believer's present labours and attainments stand essentially connected with the amount of his future recompense. After he is grounded and settled in Christ,

it is no longer a *title* he needs to heaven,—but *meetness.* If he has but this, the way is open for him to the highest honours and blessings of heaven. But every stage of advancement in the possession of these, requires its corresponding measure of fitness in the possessor. For the glory to be revealed in the people of Christ, is not to be in them, any more than in him, an inactive repose, or a mere display of material splendour, irrespective altogether of the spiritual gifts and endowments of those to whom it belongs. It is rather to consist in such a state of dignity and trust, such a measure and compass of felicity, as the individual has become qualified during his period of probation to occupy. Christ holds immeasurably the pre-eminence, because all perfection has been found in him, and he has fulfilled a work, from which the highest glory redounds to the Godhead. Then follow in their order, those who have been "made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light," each one appointed, with wise and fitting adaptation, to the place and portion for which his previous career had tended to make him meet; and the works of righteousness, which have distinguished his career, shall be taken into account, not simply as in themselves good, the offspring of divine grace, but also and chiefly as the indications of that measure of attainment in the divine life, which has been reached,—the tests of that comparative greatness, or littleness of soul toward God, which shall determine the relative place, the believer is prepared to occupy in the mansions of glory. It is an arrangement from first to last entirely of grace; and just as God confers the gifts of grace here, not when the heart has deserved, but when it is ready and prepared to receive them,—as he continually enlarges these gifts by giving more grace, when by being previously exercised to godliness it has become ripe for using and enjoying them; so does he apportion the future destiny of the believer according to "the measure of the stature" which he may have acquired in Christ.

But while this arrangement is obviously altogether of grace, and fitted, when rightly understood, rather to subdue, than to nourish pride in the believer, how wisely calculated is it to stimulate to the very uttermost his efforts in the life of godliness! When viewed in this light, how all-important is meetness for the inheritance! And what a mighty interest attaches to every stage in its progress! Momentous issues in eternity are daily growing out of his actions on earth; and what his life here proves him to be, that he will be found by his possession of a corresponding state and portion hereafter. How ready then, should he be for every good word and work! How anxious to redeem the time for God and heaven! How liberal in devising things for the glory of God, and the benefit of his fellow-men! For him there should be no pause in the work and service of God, but what the necessities of nature and the conditions of life may require. And however high he may have risen in the graces of a Christian character, as compared with many around him still living, as he professes to do, not for the passing interests of time, but for an inheritance of glory, which is to be

fixed and meted out according to his present attainments in holiness, he should be ever "forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth to those which are before, pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

SECTION SIXTH.

FAITH'S PRESENT DOWRY OF GOOD—THE DIGNITY AND BLESSING OF SONS.

This has been partly illustrated already, and may be very briefly discussed here. It indicates, however, something more and higher, than any result of faith as yet distinctly specified. The subjects of faith might have been admitted to pardon and favour, and it might have existed in their hearts as the root of life and salvation and righteousness, even though in their present spiritual condition there had been nothing to distinguish them as persons enjoying any peculiar tokens of honour and enlargement. They might have been dealt with as pardoned criminals, mercifully saved from the just consequence of their misdeeds, but still carrying with them the signs and badges of their former condemnation; or as servants, who, though treated with respect and kindness, were not deemed worthy of intimate fellowship and entire freedom. The course of God's procedure, however, toward those who exercised faith in him, gave clear proof, even in the earliest times, that they were admitted to a much higher standing, and dealt with in a more generous manner. It was such as bespoke the privileges of faith to be those of sons in the house, or of children in the kingdom, full of freedom, dignity, and blessing.

The history of Abraham affords many striking illustrations of this,—especially his being constituted, as a son, the heir of an inheritance, his enjoying in a peculiar manner the watchful care and safe keeping of God, which did not desert him even when he stumbled in his course, and caused kings to be reproved for his sake, his free and frequent intercourse with Heaven, and on one remarkable occasion—before the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah,—his admission into the secret of the divine counsels, and permission to plead with the Lord concerning them, as a man might do with his friend. In the same list also may be placed his interview with Melchisedec, the chief purpose of which evidently was, that Abraham might receive the blessing from one, who stood forth as the priest, or representative of the Most High God. The other points connected with it, which are so fully brought out in the Epistle to the Hebrews, belong rather to the province of prophecy, than of type. They refer to the prediction contained in Ps. cx. concerning Christ, "Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec;" and cannot be properly understood or illustrated, without taking into account the state of things existing when the prediction was given, especially what respected the Levitical priesthood. They properly fall to be considered, therefore, in connexion with that priesthood, which, under the Mosaic dispensation, was to be

formed out of the seed of Abraham. As regards himself, nothing further could be distinctly gathered from his giving tithes of the spoil to Melchisedec, than that he acknowledged the latter to be a true priest and representative of the Most High God, nor from his being refreshed and blessed by Melchisedec, than that he was treated with peculiar honour and respect by Him, whom Melchisedec represented. This of course implies, that Melchisedec occupied a higher standing than Abraham, "the less being manifestly blessed of the greater;" which consisted, however, not in any personal superiority, (for in that respect, who could be higher than he, who was chosen above all others to be the friend of God?) but in his official connexion with God as a priest. And that he should have left his kingly throne, and gone forth to exercise in behalf of Abraham his priestly function, treating him in the name of the Most High God to seasonable refreshment, and then blessing him, was a striking proof of the dignified and honourable position which was occupied by the father of the faithful.*

We find a renewed and farther manifestation of the same principle in the person of Isaac, whose history seems to have been mainly designed for contemplation in this point of view. It presents few particulars of importance, and very little of the interest, which hangs around the life either of his father Abraham, or of his son Jacob. But it is inferior to neither of them in the evidence it affords of the elevated and blessed nature of the condition, which belongs to those, who are born by the word or promise of God into his kingdom. For this purpose it was ordered, that he should be the son of Sarah, the lawful and proper spouse, not of the bondmaid; that his birth should be hailed as an occasion of peculiar gladness; that he should grow up to manhood amid all the freedom and fulness of his father's house; and that, as the true heir,

* The appearance of such a character as Melchisedec, on the scene of Bible history at such a time, and in such a place, himself one of a people peculiarly doomed to destruction, and yet higher in outward standing than the very head of the race intended to supplant them, is unquestionably a very singular fact, and has given rise to most extravagant suppositions. In the days of Jerome, a book was found by Evangelus, maintaining the position, that Melchisedec was an impersonation of the Holy Spirit, which Jerome, however, in his epistle to Evangelus on the subject, strongly repudiated, and refers to those of the Fathers with approbation, who held Melchisedec to be a prince of Canaan, (Vol. I. p. 440, Ed. Vallar.) Cunæus (Rep. Heb. l. III. c. 3,) unhappily endeavoured to revive the opinion of that ancient writer, with this difference, that while he held Melchisedec to be a divine person, he conceived him to be not the Holy Spirit, but the Messiah himself. In this opinion he has not been without followers, although in the present day we should suppose few are disposed to dissent from Jerome and the most judicious of the Fathers, that Melchisedec was a Canaanite, combining the two offices of priest and king, and having Salem (whether Jerusalem, or, as Jerome thinks, another place at some distance from it,) as the seat of his jurisdiction. No different opinion would have prevailed, if the prophecy in Ps. cx. and the exposition in Hebrews, with reference to the Levitical priesthood, had not seemed to warrant something higher. The discussion of the matter, therefore, is most fitly postponed till the affairs of that priesthood come to be considered. In its direct and immediate bearing, we conceive the transaction was simply designed to exhibit the greatness and honour of Abraham's position, ordered so, however, that it might afterwards be referred to, as it was in Ps. cx., in a way fitted to bring out the proper character of Messiah's priesthood, as contradistinguished from that of Levi, which the Jews began latterly to exalt beyond due measure, and consequently to misapprehend.

he should enter in due time upon the possession of the father's inheritance, while the other members of the family were sent away with inferior portions. If *they* got wherewith to live, *he* had besides wherewith to enjoy himself in state and affluence; and in respect to dignity of position, and fulness of honour and blessing, he might justly be called the only son of Abraham.

In the history of Jacob, the next heir of promise, the principle at first seemed, on account of Jacob's own misconduct, as if it were to be entirely lost sight of. But this was only for a time; and it shone out at length all the more brightly, when God created for his servant a fortune out of nothing, and so replenished him with honour and blessing, that he completely triumphed over all the enmity and fraud with which he had to contend in others, and the various troubles and misdemeanors, which arose within the bosom of his own family. It was, however, in the history of his son Joseph, that the principle re-appeared in its proper magnitude, and received in that age of the church its last, as well as brightest manifestation. Of all Jacob's family, he seems to have been the only one, who in early life imbibed the spirit of faith and piety, which reigned in the bosom of his father; he alone was in disposition, as in outward privilege, a child of promise, and on that account was the object of his father's peculiar love and affection. But on the same account he became the object of peculiar jealousy and aversion on the part of his ungodly brethren; and, after being saved from impending destruction, was sold by them as a poor captive, to make his way, as he best might, in a foreign country. There, indeed, the blessing appears at the first to cling to him, as a girdle to his loins; whatever he does prospers; but the very strength of his faith and steadfastness of his heart bring him again into fresh disasters, which threatened for a time to prove his ruin. The blessing of Heaven, however, still cleaves to him, even when he has been thrust down into the lowest place; until at length by a new turn of providence, the Lord "brings forth his righteousness as the light, and his judgment as the noon-day." It is ascertained by conclusive evidence, that he stands in a relation to Heaven far exceeding in intimacy and closeness of fellowship that of other men; that the secret of God in a peculiar sense is with him—and so, he is raised at once to the highest place of power and influence; the richest kingdom in the world delights to honour him with the highest confidence and regard; and Heaven itself pours into his lap the treasures of plenty, that he might save his father's house, as well as thousands besides, from perishing, and be not only pre-eminently blessed in his own person, but the honoured instrument also of conveying the means of life and blessing unto others.

In viewing the history of Joseph simply in this light, as serving to illustrate the height of honour and blessing, to which the children of faith are destined, we select only its more prominent features, and determine its place in the divine economy by its leading characteristic. We cannot pass from it, however, without mentioning, that there is such a wonderful variety and completeness in

it, as to embody to some extent nearly all the other principles, which have been already noticed in connexion with this portion of God's preparatory dispensations, and the germs may even be found in it of others, of which scarcely any traces are elsewhere to be discerned in the times before the law. On this account it may be said in some measure to defy any attempt at regular classification; and we believe, with Sack, that the "remarkable compass, which is given to the history of this noblest shoot of the patriarchal age, was designed to draw special attention to it, as the closing and most complete type of this period of a historical revelation. Its antitype is to be sought in the whole history of the Saviour, from his first appearance in public, till his ascension, or rather till the consummation of his divine kingdom. Jesus Christ was envied and persecuted by his brethren and kindred, while God gave him manifestations of his being well pleased with him. He was sold and delivered into the hands of his enemies. His most righteous behaviour under sufferings and death, while in the company of evil-doers, was the cause of his heavenly elevation to a partnership with the Father in his kingdom, thus becoming the deliverer and benefactor of his people, dispensing to them the bread of spiritual life; and it is to be expected, as has already indeed partly taken place, that his people, his brethren after the flesh, would some time turn themselves to him in a feeling of their own helplessness, and ruefully acknowledging, that they have been cast off for their own and their father's enmity, would go to receive from him the bread of life, and the means of attaining to a blessed existence. The peculiarity and beauty of this type lies partly in the circumstance of its forming a complete life-history, thus displaying the more undeniably the intentionally designing and developing hand of Divine providence, and partly in the circumstance, that the fulfilment has not yet been fully brought to light, though the resemblance of what has already been fulfilled must beget the utmost confidence in regard to what is still future."*

Whether we look at the features of the type thus generally, or more specially in reference to the individual point on which we regard it as mainly bearing, it is unquestionably in Christ that we are to seek for the first and highest fulfilment. He is pre-eminently the elect of God, the child of promise, the Holy One of Israel, in whom faith and every principle of a divine life had its perfect exercise; therefore was he also, in a sense in which no others could be, the Beloved of the Father, treated to the dignity of a Son in the house, made partaker even of the whole fulness of the Godhead, and the dispenser of life and blessing to all the members of the household. But while this is his without measure, it is in measure also participated by those who, through faith, have entered into his grace, and attained to an interest in his righteousness. Of one and all of them it may be said, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on them, that they should be called the sons of God!" "And if sons, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs

* Sack's Apologetik, p. 340.

with Christ." (1 John iii. 1; Rom. viii. 15.) But how does it become theirs? How do they enter on this sonship condition, with its attendant privileges and hopes? No otherwise than through faith; as it is written, "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John i. 12.) So that in the very acts of receiving and resting upon Christ, they become new creatures; while they believe they are regenerated; and the moment of a man's laying hold in humble confidence upon Christ, is, at the same time, the moment of his new birth to God, and his entering on all the distinguishing and blissful privileges of children.

In the state and experience, therefore, of all believers, the several rays of honour, enlargement, and blessing which shone from the outward and terrestrial life of such men as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, should be found meeting upon the higher path of the Christian life, and shedding over it the radiance of a spiritual glory. Let the heirs of salvation look here, and see what they are called to be in spiritual rank and privilege, and how, as thus gifted on the part of God, it behooves them to walk before him. As free-born adopted children of God, there is no longer any bondage or servitude resting on their condition; for them the yoke of the law is broken, the condemnation of Heaven is abolished; theirs is the position of sons in the house of God, without the least prejudice or abatement, to live in the house for ever, and enjoy its highest honours. They dwell in the region which angels visit, which the Spirit of all grace inhabits as his own, which is continually gladdened with the Lord's favour, and with refreshments from his presence. While moving through the pilgrimage of life, they are at once blessed in their own souls, and the instruments of blessing to others; and they are cheered as they proceed by the prospect stretching before them in the regions of a coming eternity, of an inheritance in the everlasting kingdom and glory of the Son of God. So is it, and so must it for ever be, in the case of all who are in any measure conformed to the pattern exhibited in those patriarchs, whose outward state and condition were designed to represent the high dignity and rich heritage which faith secures for its possessors, even in this troubled and imperfect period of their existence. The most advanced believers will ever have reason, on comparing themselves with such a standard, to confess with the apostle, that they do "not count themselves to have attained (the height of privilege and blessing to which they are called,) or to be already perfect." May they also be ever led, like him, to "follow after, that they may apprehend that for which they are apprehended of Christ Jesus."

SECTION SEVENTH.

FAITH'S FINAL PORTION, OR, THE HOPE OF THE INHERITANCE.

There is only one principle more, which we find to have any thing like a large and prominent place in the typical developments of that portion of Old Testament history to which our view is at

present limited; that, namely, which respects *the hope of the inheritance ultimately to be conferred on the heirs of promise.* It is a large field, and will require a pretty lengthened investigation. It is also in regard to the point of view properly belonging to the present inquiry, of a more involved nature than those already considered; we mean, the principle as developed in the type, is not so easily viewed apart from the antitype, but naturally runs into the latter, and terminates in it, even in the case of the earlier believers. And instead of endeavouring to keep the one throughout carefully separate from the other, it will contribute both to the greater freedom and the fuller satisfaction of our inquiry, if we first of all consider the subject in its proper bearing and extent, as concerns the patriarchal worshippers themselves, and only afterwards point out what there was typical in their position or circumstances.

What, then, had these patriarchal worshippers to hope for? And on what was their hope founded? We have already seen, when considering the first symbols of worship in connexion with the facts of primeval history, that man had from the very first proposed to him the hope of an inheritance, and in connexion with that, the prospect of an after state of being. His natural position after the fall, was that of a defeated and ruined being, a prodigal, who had suffered himself to be spoiled of his fair inheritance; and as a subject of manifested grace, he was elevated to the hope of an ultimate recovery from the evil, and stood, in so far as he exercised faith toward God, in the attitude of an expectant of good things to come. The views he had of these good things to be expected, or the inheritance to be looked for, would naturally take their shape and hue from what he had lost; and, seeing still before him the garden of Eden with its tree of life, and its visible tokens of divine glory, the removal of those ministers of vengeance that now guarded its approach, and his re-instalment in the possession of its fulness of life and blessing, would probably be the whole that he at first anticipated as the result of that work of righteousness, which was one day to counteract the evil of sin. But as age after age rolled on, and the inhabitants of the world multiplied into an exceeding great number, while still there was no appearance of the promised recovery and restitution, something different from that identical Eden which was lost, something higher and more enlarged would naturally come to be the object of hope. For what was that garden to so many? And if the abode of purity and bliss was to reach beyond and above that, the thought was obvious, that some strange work of purification must needs be done upon the earth at large; for all now, excepting that still hallowed but secluded spot, bore the withering curse of its Maker—bore it, indeed, at last so heavily, that poor human nature groaned beneath the burden, and the readiest thought that occurred to a pious man on the birth of his son was, "This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." (Gen. v. 29.)

Still, however, their view and prospect of what was to come, would chiefly fashion themselves after the model of what had been —for they had no other rule to go by, and the hope given them was wholly of a restitutionary character, leading them to think of the recovery of an old, not of the acquirement of a new possession. We take it to be incredible, that they should have looked for any portion out of the domain of this very earth; for how should they have dreamt of a victory over evil in any other region, but that in which the evil had entered and prevailed? Or how could the hope of restitution have expected to realize itself any where, but just where the loss had been sustained? And then, however enlarged might be the idea which the progress of events constrained them to form of the good to be obtained, above any thing that had hitherto been seen on earth, yet the pattern from which it drew its shape and character, could be no other than the paradise which sin had alienated from them. *That* expanded and prepared anew for the dwelling-place of redeemed multitudes,—made to embrace, it may be, the whole circumference of the globe,—wrested for ever from the serpent's brood, and rendered throughout all its bounds beautiful and good as it was on creation's morn—that, and no more, no other, must have been what the first race of patriarchal believers hoped and waited for, as the inheritance they were destined to possess.

But the deluge came, changing the outward appearance of the earth, in some respects also the constitution and government, under which it was placed, and so, preparing the way for a corresponding change in the hopes that were cherished of a coming inheritance. The old world then perished,—being not only swept of its corrupt inhabitants, but shorn also of its paradisaical remains, at once the monuments of what had been lost, and the symbols of what was in due time to be won. The new world, on which Noah and his family now entered, soon proved itself no paradise restored, —for sin and death had their dwelling in it as before, and the serpent still had his brood to war with the seed of God, and man was yet doomed to earn his bread by hard labour from the unwilling earth. Only, a restraint was laid on the evil tendencies of nature, so that man's wild and tumultuous passions were not henceforth to have the ungovernable scope they had before, and no second deluge was to interrupt, with its wasting desolation, the settled order of providence. But however much the people of God had gained in some respects by the deluge, in regard to the hope of a final inheritance of blessing, it rather placed them in a worse position than before; for it utterly destroyed the primeval emblems of it, and left men with nothing for hope to feed on, but the general promise of restitution. This, however, was only for a time; and the generation had scarcely passed away, which had witnessed these emblems of a better world, till the Lord gave, in the call to Abraham, a new shape and direction to the prospect of an inheritance. This was now made to assume the aspect, not of a garden, as for one man and his single partner, but of a whole region, as for

a numerous family,—the pleasant and fertile land of Canaan, a vast territory when viewed as Heaven's gift to the father of the faithful.

It is of importance, that we mark the precise words of the promise to Abraham, concerning this inheritance. As it first occurs, it runs, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee, and I will make of thee a great nation," &c. Gen. xii. 1. Then, when he reached Canaan, the promise was renewed to him in these terms, "Unto thy seed will I give this land," v. 7. More fully and definitely, after Lot separated from Abraham, was it again given, "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever," xiii. 14, 15. Again, in chap. xv. 7, "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it;" and toward the close of the same chapter, it is said, "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt, unto the great river." In chap. 17th, the promise was more formally converted into a covenant, and sealed by the ordinance of circumcision; and there the words used respecting the inheritance are, "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God." We read only of one occasion in the life of Isaac, when he received the promise of the inheritance, and the words then used were, "Unto thee, and unto thy seed, will I give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father," chap. xxvi. 3. Such also were the words addressed to Jacob at Bethel, "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac, the land whereon thou liest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed;" and in precisely the same terms was the promise again made to Jacob many years afterwards, as recorded in chap. xxxv. 12.

It cannot but appear striking, that to each one of these patriarchs successively, the promise of the land of Canaan should have been given, first to themselves, and then to their posterity,—while, during their own life-times, they never were permitted to get beyond the condition of strangers and pilgrims, and, as having no right to any possession within its borders, were obliged to purchase, at the marketable value, a small field for a burying-ground. How shall we account for the promise, then, so uniformly running, "to thee," and to "thy seed?" Some, as Ainsworth and Bush, tell us that *and* here is the same as *even*, to thee, even to thy seed; as if a man were all one with his offspring, or the name of the latter were but another name for himself! Gill gives a somewhat more plausible turn to it, thus: "God gave Abram the title to it now, and to them the possession of it for future times; gave him it to sojourn in now when he pleased, and for his posterity to dwell in hereafter." But the gift was the land for an inheritance, not for

a place of sojourn; and a title, which left him personally without a foot's-breadth of possession, could not be regarded in that light as any real boon to him. Warburton, as usual, confronts the difficulty more boldly: "In the literal sense it is a promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham and to his posterity; and in this sense it was literally fulfilled, though Abraham was never personally in possession of it; since Abraham and his posterity, put collectively, signify the RACE OF ABRAHAM; and that race possessed the land of Canaan. And surely God may be allowed to explain his own promise: now, though he tells Abraham, he would give *him* the land, yet at the same time, he assured him, that it would be many hundred years before his *posterity* should be put in possession of it, Gen. xv. 13, &c. And as concerning himself, that he should go to his fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age. Thus we see, that both what God explained to be his meaning, and what Abraham understood him to mean, was, that his posterity, after a certain time, should be led into possession of the land."*

But if this were really the whole meaning, the thought naturally occurs, it is strange so plain a meaning should have been so ambiguously expressed. Why not simply say, "thy posterity," if posterity alone were intended, and save commentators from the clumsy expedient of having to throw a man, with his immediate descendants, into the same bundle with his later posterity, as together making up one race, in order to cover the palpable incorrectness of the words in their obvious meaning? Why also should the promise have been renewed at a later period, with a pointed distinction between Abraham and his posterity, yet with an assurance that the promise was to him, as well as to them, "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger?" And why should Stephen have made such special reference to the apparent incongruity between the personal condition of Abraham and the promise given to him, as if there were some further meaning in what was said than lay on the surface, —"He gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on, yet he promised to give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him?" Acts vii. 5.

We do not see how these questions can receive any satisfactory explanation, so long as no account is made of the promise personally given to the patriarchs. And there are others equally left without explanation. For no sufficient reason can be assigned on that hypothesis, for the extreme anxiety of Jacob and Joseph to have their bones carried to the sepulchre of their fathers, in the land of Canaan—betokening, as it evidently seemed to do, a conviction, that to them also belonged a personal interest in the land. Neither does it appear how the fact of Abraham and his immediate offspring, "confessing that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth," which they did no otherwise, that we are aware of, than by living as strangers and pilgrims in Canaan, should have

* Legation of Moses, B. VI. sec. 3.

proved that they were looking for and desiring a better country, that is, a heavenly one. And then, strange to think, if nothing more were meant by the promise than the view now under consideration would imply, when the posterity who were to occupy the land did obtain possession of it, we find the men of faith taking up precisely the same confession as to their being strangers and pilgrims in it, which was witnessed by their forefathers, who never had it in possession. Even after they became possessors, it seems they were still like their wandering ancestors, expectants and heirs of something better, and faith had to be exercised, lest they should lose the proper fulfilment of the promise, (Ps. xxxix. 12, xcv., cxix. 19; 1 Chron. xxix. 15.) Surely if the earthly Canaan had been the whole inheritance they were warranted to look for, after they were settled in it, the condition of pilgrims and strangers no longer was theirs—they had reached their proper destiny—they were dwelling in their appointed home—the promise had received its due fulfilment.

These manifold difficulties and apparent inconsistencies will vanish—(and we see no other way in which they can be satisfactorily removed)—by supposing, what is certainly in accordance with the tenor of revelation, that the promise of Canaan as an inheritance to the people of God was part of a connected and growing scheme of preparatory arrangements, which were to have their proper outgoing and final termination in the establishment of Christ's everlasting kingdom. Viewed thus, the grant of Canaan must be regarded as coming in the room of the garden of Eden, with its symbols of the tree of life, and the cherubim of glory—as representing and typifying the inheritance of the purchased possession, which, in the fulness of time, was to be brought in for the whole elect family of God. And if so, then we may naturally expect the following consequences to have arisen:—First, that whatever transactions may have taken place concerning the actual Canaan, these would be all ordered so as to subserve the higher design, in connexion with which the appointment was made; and, second, that as a sort of vail must have been allowed meanwhile to hang over this ultimate design, (for the issue of redemption could not be made fully manifest till the redemption itself was brought in,) a certain degree of dubiety would attach to some of the things spoken regarding it—these would appear strange, or impossible, if viewed only in reference to the temporary inheritance—and would have the effect, with men of faith, as no doubt they were intended, to compel the mind to break through the outward shell of the promise, and contemplate the rich kernel enclosed within. Thus the promise being made so distinctly and repeatedly to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while personally they were allowed no settled footing in the inheritance bestowed, could scarcely fail to impress them, and their more pious descendants, with the conviction, that higher and more important relations were included under those in which they stood to the land of Canaan during their earthly sojourn, and such as required another order of things to

fulfil them. They must have been convinced, that for some great and substantial reason, not by a mere fiction of the imagination, they had been identified by God with their posterity as to their interest in the promised inheritance. And so, must have felt shut up to the belief, that when God's purposes were completely fulfilled, his word of promise would be literally verified, and that their respective deaths should ultimately be found to raise no effectual barrier in the way of their actual share in the inheritance; as the same God, who would have raised Isaac from the dead, had he been put to death, to maintain the integrity of his word, was equally able, when the same reason required it, to raise them up.

Certainly the exact and perfect manner, in which the other line of promise, that which respected a seed to Abraham, was fulfilled, gave reason to expect a fulfilment in regard to this also, in the most proper and complete sense. Abraham did not at first understand how closely God's words were to be interpreted; and after waiting in vain for some years for the promised seed by Sarah, he began to think, that God must have meant an offspring, that should be his only by adoption, and seems to have thought of constituting the son of his steward his heir. Then, when admonished of his error in entertaining such a thought, and told, that the seed was to spring from his own loins, he acceded, after another long period of fruitless waiting, to the proposal of Sarah, to go in to Hagar, under the impression, that though *he* was to be the father of the seed, yet it should not be by his proper wife; the expected good was to be obtained by a worldly expedient, and to be his only in a kind of secondary sense. Here again, however, he was admonished of error, commanded to cease from such crooked ways, and walk in uprightness before God, reminded that he, who made the promise, was the Almighty God, to whom, therefore, no impossibility connected with the age of Sarah could be of any moment, and assured that the long promised child was to be the son of him and his lawful spouse. (Gen. xvii. 1—17.) And when Abraham was thus taught to interpret one part of the promise in the most exact and literal sense, how natural was it to infer, that he must do the same also with the other part? If when God said, "thou shalt be the father of a seed," it became clear that the word could receive nothing short of the highest possible fulfilment; what else, what less could be expected, when God said, "thou shalt inherit this land," than that the fulfilment was to be equally proper and complete? The providence of God, which furnished such an interpretation in the one case, could not but beget the conviction, that a similar spirit of interpretation was to be applied to the other, and that as the promise of the inheritance was given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as well as to their seed, so it should be made good in their experience not less than in that of their posterity.

No doubt, such a belief implied, that there must be a resurrection from the dead before the promise could be realized; and to those, who conceive that immortality was altogether a blank page

to the eye of an ancient Israelite, the idea may seem to carry its own refutation along with it. The Rabbis, however, with all their blindness, seem to have had juster, because more scriptural, notions of the truth and purposes of God, in this respect. For, on Ex. vi. 4, the Talmud in Gemara, in reply to the question, "Where does the law teach the resurrection of the dead?" thus distinctly answers, "In that place where it is said, I have established my covenant with thee, to give thee the land of Canaan. For it is not said, with *you*, but with *thee*, (lit. yourselves."*) The same answer substantially, we are told, was returned by Rabbi Gamaliel, when the Sadducees pressed him with a similar question. And in a passage quoted by Warburton (B. vi. sec. 3,) from Manasseh Ben-Israel, we find the argument still more fully stated: "God said to Abraham, I will give to thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger. But it appears, that Abraham and the other patriarchs did not possess that land; therefore it is of necessity that they should be raised up to enjoy the good promises,—else the promises of God should be vain and false. So that we have here a proof, not only of the immortality of the soul, but also of the essential foundation of the law, namely, the resurrection of the dead." It is surely not too much to suppose, that what Jewish Rabbis could so certainly draw from the word of God, may have been perceived by wise and holy patriarchs. And the fact, of which an inspired writer assures us, that Abraham so readily believed in the possible resurrection of Isaac to a present life, is itself conclusive proof, that he would not be slow to believe in his own resurrection to a future life, when the word of promise seemed no otherwise capable of receiving its proper fulfilment. Indeed, the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead, not that of the immortality of the soul, is the form which the prospect of an after-state of being must have chiefly assumed in the minds of the earlier believers, because that, which most obviously and naturally grew out of the promises made to them, as well as most accordant with their native cast of thought; and nothing but the undue influence of the Gentile philosophy on men's minds could have led them to imagine, as they generally have done, the reverse to have been the case.

In the writings of the Greeks and Romans, especially those of the former, we find the distinction constantly drawn between matter and spirit, body and soul,—and the one generally represented as having only elements of evil inhering in it, and the other elements of good. So far from looking for the resurrection of the body, as necessary to the final well-being of men, full and complete happiness was held to be impossible so long as the soul was united to the body. Death was so far considered by them a boon, that it emancipated the ethereal principle from its prison house; and their visions of future bliss, when such visions were entertained, pre-

* Sic habetur traditio Rab. Simai; quo loco astruit Lex resurrectionem mortuorum? Nempe ubi dicitur, "Aque etiam constabilivi fœdus meum cum ipsis, ut dem ipsis terram Canaan." Non enim dicitur *vobis*, sed *ipsis*.

sented to the eye of hope scenes of delight, in which the disembodied spirit alone was to find its satisfaction and repose. Hence it is quite natural to hear the better part of them speaking with contempt of all that concerned the body, looking upon death as a final, as well as a happy release from its vile affections, and promising themselves a perennial enjoyment in the world of spirits. "In what way shall we bury you?" said Crito to Socrates, immediately before his death. "As you please," was the reply. "I cannot, my friends, persuade Crito that I am the Socrates that is now conversing, and ordering every thing that has been said; but he thinks I am that man whom he will shortly see a corpse, and asks how you should bury me. But what I have all along been talking so much about,—that when I shall have drunk the poison I shall no longer stay with you, but shall, forsooth, go away to certain felicities of the blest,—this I seem to myself to have been saying in vain, whilst comforting at the same time you and myself." And in another part of the same dialogue (Phædo,) after speaking of the impossibility of attaining to the true knowledge and discernment of things, so long as the soul is kept in the lumpish and impure body, he is represented as congratulating himself on the prospect now immediately before him: "If these things are true, there is much reason to hope that he who has reached my present position, shall there soon abundantly obtain that, for the sake of which I have laboured so hard during this life; so that I encounter with a lively hope my appointed removal." No doubt such representations give a highly coloured and far too favourable view of the expectations which even the better part of the heathen world cherish of a future state of being,—for to most of them the whole was overshadowed with doubt and uncertainty, too often, indeed, the subject of absolute unbelief. But in this respect the idea it presents is perfectly correct, that so far as hope *was* exercised toward the future, it connected itself altogether with the condition and destiny of the soul; and so abhorrent was the thought of a resurrection of the body to their notions of future good, that Tertullian did not hesitate to affirm the heresy, which denied that Christian doctrine to be the common result of the whole Gentile philosophy.*

It was precisely the reverse with believers in ancient and primitive times. *Their* prospects of a blessed immortality were mainly associated with the resurrection of the body; and the dark period to them was the intermediate state between death and the resurrection, which even at a comparatively late stage in their history presented itself to their view as a state of gloom, silence and forgetfulness. They contemplated man, not in the light in which an airy, speculative philosophy might regard him, but in the more natural and proper one of a compound being, to which matter as essentially belongs as spirit, and in the well-being of which there must unite the happy condition both of soul and body. Nay, the materials from which they had to form their views and prospects

* Ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium philosophorum schola sumitur, De Praesc. adv. Haeret.

of a future state of being, pointed most directly to the resurrection, and passed over in silence the period intervening between that and death. Thus, the primeval promise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, taught them to live in expectation of a time when death should be swallowed up in victory, —for death being the fruit of the serpent's triumph, what else could his complete overthrow be, than the reversal of death—the resurrection from the dead? So also the prophecy embodied in the emblems of the tree of life, still standing in the midst of the garden of Eden, with its way of approach meanwhile guarded by the flaming sword, and possessed by the cherubim of glory,—implying, that when the spoiler should be himself spoiled, and the way of life should again be laid open for the children of promise, they should have access to the food of immortality, but only, of course, by rising out of death, and entering on the resurrection-state. The same conclusion grew, as we have just seen, most naturally, and we may say inevitably, out of that portion of the promises made to the fathers of the Jewish race, which assured them of a *personal* inheritance in the land of Canaan,—for dying as they did without having obtained any inheritance in it, how could the word of promise be verified to them, but by their being raised from the dead to receive what it warranted them to expect? In perfect accordance with these earlier intimations, or ground promises, as they may be called, we find, as we descend the stream of time, and listen to the more express utterances of prophecy regarding the hopes of the church, that the grand point on which they are all made to centre, is the resurrection from the dead;—and it is so, no doubt, for the reason, that as death is from the first represented as the wages of sin, the evil pre-eminently under which humanity groans, so the abolition of death by mortality being swallowed up of life, is understood to carry in its train the restitution of all things.

The Psalms, which are so full of the experiences and hopes of David, and other holy men of old, while they express only fear and discomfort in regard to the state after death, not unfrequently point to the resurrection from the dead as the great consummation of desire and expectation: "My flesh also shall rest in hope, for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption," Ps. xvi. 9, 10. "Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling; but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me," xlix. 14, 15. The prophets, who are utterly silent regarding the state of the disembodied soul, speak still more explicitly of a resurrection from the dead, and evidently connect with it the brightest hopes of the church. Thus Isaiah, "He will swallow up death in victory," xxv. 8; and again, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise; awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust," xxvi. 19. To the like effect, Hosea xiii. 14, "I will

ransom them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." The vision of the dry bones in the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel, whether understood of a literal resurrection from the state of the dead, or of a figurative resurrection, a political resuscitation from a downcast and degraded condition, strongly indicates, in either case, the characteristic nature of their future prospects.* Then, finally, in Daniel we read, ch. xii., not only that he was himself, after resting for a season among the dead, "to stand in his lot at the end of the days," but also that at the great crisis of the church's history, when they should be for ever rescued from the power of the enemy, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth should awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Besides these direct and palpable proofs of a resurrection in the Jewish scriptures, and of the peculiar place it holds there, the Rabbinical and modern Jews, it is well known, refer to many others as inferentially teaching the same doctrine. That the earlier Jews were not behind them, either in the importance they attached to the doctrine, or in their persuasion of its frequent recurrence in the Old Testament scriptures, we may assuredly gather from the tenacity with which all but the Sadducees evidently held it in our Lord's time, and the ready approval which he met with when inferring it from the declaration made to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." It is nothing to the purpose, therefore, to allege, as has often been done, against any clear or well-grounded belief, on the part of the ancient Jews, regarding a future and immortal state of being, such passages as speak of the darkness, silence, and nothingness of the condition immediately subsequent to death, and so long as the body rests in the tomb. Of a heathenish immortality, which ascribed to the soul a perpetual existence separate from the body, and considered its happiness in such a state as the ultimate good of man, they certainly knew and believed nothing. But we are persuaded, no tenet was more firmly and sacredly held among them from the earliest periods of their history, than that of the resurrection from the dead, as the commencement of a final and everlasting portion of good to the people of God. And when the Jewish doctors give to the resurrection of the dead a place among the thirteen fundamental articles of their faith, and cut off from all inheritance in a future state of felicity, those who deny it, we have no reason to regard the doctrine as attaining to a higher place in their hands, than it did with their fathers before the Christian era.

There was something more, however, in the Jewish faith concerning the resurrection, than its being simply held as an article

* Nunquam enim poneretur, etc. "For never (says Jerome on Ez. xxxvii.) would the image of the resurrection have been employed to signify the restitution of the Jewish people, unless the resurrection itself had been a reality, and had been believed in as a coming event; since no one thinks of confirming uncertain things by others, which have no existence."

in their creed, and held to be a fact that should one day be realized in the history of the church. It connected itself peculiarly with the promise made to the fathers, as some of the foregoing testimonies show, and especially with the work and advent of Messiah. They not only believed, that there would be a resurrection of the dead, to a greater or less extent, when Messiah came, (see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. John i. 21, v. 25,) but that his work, especially as regards the promised inheritance, could only be carried into effect through the resurrection. Levi* holds it as a settled point, that "the resurrection of the dead will be very near the time of the redemption," meaning by the redemption the full and final enjoyment of all blessing in the land of promise, and that such is the united sense of all the prophets, who have spoken of the times of Messiah. In this, indeed, he only expresses the opinion commonly entertained by Jewish writers, who constantly assert that there will be a resurrection of the whole Jewish race, to meet and rejoice with Christ, when he comes to Jerusalem, and who often thrust forward their views regarding it, when there is no proper occasion to do so. Thus, in Sohar, Genes. fol. 77, as quoted by Schoettgen, II. p. 367, R. Nehorai is reported to have said on Abraham's speaking to his servant, Gen. xxiv. 2, "We are to understand the servant of God, his senior domus. And who is he? Metatron, (Messiah,) who, as we have said, will bring forth the souls from their sepulchres." But a higher authority still may be appealed to. For the apostle to the gentiles thus expresses—and with evident approval as to the general principle—the mind of his countrymen in regard to the Messiah and the resurrection; "I now stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come—for which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" (Acts xxvi. 6—8.) The connexion, in which the resurrection of the dead is here placed with the great promise of a Messiah, for which the Jews are represented as so eagerly and intently looking, evidently implies, that the two were usually coupled together in the Jewish faith, nay that the one could reach its proper fulfilment only through the performance of the other, and that in believing on a Messiah risen from the dead, the apostle was acting in perfect accordance with the hopes of his nation.

But now, to apply all this to the subject under consideration, the promised inheritance,—if that inheritance was promised in a way, which from the very first implied a resurrection from the dead, before it could be rightly enjoyed,—and if all along, even when Canaan was possessed by the seed of Abraham, the men of faith still looked forward to another inheritance, when the curse should be utterly abolished, the blessing fully received, and death finally swallowed up in victory—then, a twofold boon must have

* Dissertations on the Prophecies of Old Test., vol. I., p. 56.

been conveyed to Abraham and his seed, under the promise of the land of Canaan; one to be realized in the natural, and the other in the resurrection state,—a mingled and temporary good before, and a complete and permanent one after, the restitution of all things by the Messiah. So that, in regard to the ultimate designs of God, the land of Canaan would serve much the same purpose as the garden of Eden, with its tree of life and cherubim of glory—it was to the eye of faith a type, and a pledge of the final inheritance, the everlasting rest which remaineth for the people of God. There was this difference, indeed, between the two, that the former was a type only to the eye, but this in some measure also to the taste —the one could only be seen and contemplated by the heirs of promise, while the other was actually possessed by them. The difference, however, is not essential, and only indicates an advance in God's revelations and purposes of grace, making what was ultimately designed for the faithful more sure to them by their instalment, through a singular train of providential arrangements, in a present inheritance of good. They thus enjoyed a real and substantial earnest of the better things to come, which were to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

But what were these better things themselves? What was thus indicated to Abraham and his believing posterity, as their coming inheritance of good? If it was clear that they must have attained to the resurrection from the dead, before they could properly enjoy the possession, it could not be Canaan in its natural state, as a region of the present earth, that was to be inherited. For that considered as the abode of Abraham and all his elect posterity, when raised from the tomb and collected into an innumerable multitude, must have appeared of far too limited dimensions, as well as of unsuitable character. Though it might well seem a vast inheritance for any living generation, that should spring from the loins of Abraham, yet it was palpably inadequate for the possession of his collected seed, when it should have become like the stars of heaven for multitude. And not only so, but as the risen body is to be, not a natural, but a glorified one, the inheritance it is to occupy must be a glorified one too. The fairest portions of the earth, in its present fallen and corruptible state, could be a fit possession for men only so long as in their persons they are themselves fallen and corruptible. When redeemed from the power of the grave, and entered on the glories of the new creation, the natural Canaan will be as unfit to be their proper home and possession, as the original Eden would have been with its tree of life. Much more so, indeed, for the earth in its present state is adapted for the support and enjoyment of man, as constituted, not only after the earthly Adam, but after him as underlying the pernicious effects of the curse; and the ultimate inheritance destined for Abraham and the heirs of promise, which was to become theirs after the resurrection from the dead, must be as much higher and better than any thing, which the earth can furnish as it now is, as man's nature, when glorified, shall be higher and better than it is while in bondage to sin and death.

Nothing less than this certainly is taught in what is said of the inheritance, as expected by patriarchs, in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things, declare plainly, that they seek a country. And truly if they had been mindful of that country, from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city." (Heb. xi. 13—16.) Without entering into any minute commentary on this passage, it cannot but be regarded as perfectly conclusive of two points: First, that Abraham, and the heirs with him of the same promise, did understand and believe, that the inheritance secured to them under the promise of Canaan, (for that was the only word spoken to them of an inheritance,) was one in which they had a personal interest. And then, secondly, that the inheritance as it was to be occupied and enjoyed by them, was to be not a temporary, but a final one, —one, that might fitly be designated a "heavenly country," a city built by divine hands, and based on immovable foundations,—in short, the ultimate and proper resting-place of redeemed and risen natures. This was what these holy patriarchs expected and desired, —what they were warranted to expect and desire, for their conduct in this respect is the subject of commendation, and said to be the necessary result of God's not being ashamed to be called their God; and it was, finally, what they found contained in the promise to them, of an inheritance in the land, in which they were pilgrims and strangers, for to that promise alone could they look for the special ground of the hopes they cherished of a sure and final possession.

But the question again returns, what is that possession itself really to be? That it cannot be the country itself of Palestine, either in its present condition, or as it might become under any system of culture of which nature is capable, is too obvious to require any lengthened proof. The twofold fact, that the possession was to be man's ultimate, heavenly inheritance, and that it could be attained only after the resurrection from the dead, clearly forbids the supposition of its being the literal land of Canaan, under any conceivable form of renovated fruitfulness and beauty. This is also evident from the nature of the promise, which formed the ground of Abraham's hope,—which made mention only of the land of Canaan,—and which, as pointing to an ulterior inheritance, must have belonged to that combination of type with prophecy, which we placed first, viz. having the promise or prediction, not in the language employed, but in the typical character of the object, which that language described. The promise made to Abraham was simple enough in itself, holding out for an inheritance the land of Canaan, as distinctly marked off by certain geographical boundaries; it was not properly in the words of that promise, that he

could read his destiny to any future and ultimate inheritance; but putting together the two things, that the promised good was to be realized only in an after-state of being, and that all the relations of the church then were preparative and temporary representations of better things to come, he might then perceive, that the earthly Canaan was a type of what was finally to be enjoyed, that the establishment of his offspring there would constitute a prophecy, *in fact*, of the exaltation of the whole of an elect seed to their destined state of blessing and glory. But that being the case,—the prediction standing altogether in the type,—the thing predicted and promised must, in conformity with all typical relations, have been another and far higher thing than that which served to predict and promise it,—Canaan could not be the type of itself,—it could only represent, on the lower platform of nature, what was hereafter to be developed on the higher platform of the kingdom of God,—and as far as the things of fallen and corrupt nature differ from, and are inferior to, those of redemption, so far must the rest of Canaan have differed from, and been inferior to, "that rest which remaineth for the people of God."

What that final rest or inheritance, which forms the antitype to Canaan, really is, we may gather from the words of the apostle concerning it in Eph. i. 14, where he calls the Spirit "the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession."* It is plain, that the subject here discoursed of, is not our

* That the received translation gives here the sense of the original with substantial correctness, I am fully satisfied. The latter part of it, εις απολυτρωσιν της περιποιησεως, has been variously understood, and its natural import too commonly overlooked. Robinson in his Lexicon makes it, απολυτρωσιν την περιποιηθεισαν, the redemption acquired for us,—a violent change, for which there is no necessity, and for which no parallel use of the word can be produced. The only two senses, in which the word occurs in the New Testament, are, 1. *Acquiring, acquisition, obtaining*, 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 2. *The thing obtained* or *acquired, possession*, in which sense, unquestionably, it is used in Mal. iii. 17, and in 1 Pet. ii. 9. In both of these places it is applied to the church, as God's acquired, purchased possession, and is equal to his peculium, or property in a peculiar sense, his select treasure, which is related to him as nothing else is, which he has acquired or purchased, περιεποιησατο, by his own blood, Acts xx. 28, comp. also Ex. xix. 6; Deut. vii. 6; Tit. ii. 14. Calvin, and the great majority of interpreters, are of opinion, that because in these passages περιποιησις is used as a designation of the church, considered as God's peculiar property, it has the same meaning here, "unto, or until the redemption of his purchased people," as Boothroyd expressly renders. But this view is liable to three objections. 1. The word περιποιησις, is nowhere absolutely and by itself put for "purchased people," or "church;" when so used, it has the addition of λαος. 2. The redemption of the church would then be regarded as future, whereas it is always represented as past. We read of the redemption of the *bodies* of believers as yet to take place, but never of the redemption of the *church;* that is uniformly spoken of as having been effected by the death of Christ. 3. It does not suit the connexion; for the apostle is speaking of the indwelling of the Spirit as the earnest of the inheritance, to which believers are destined, and as an earnest is given as a temporary substitute for the inheritance or possession, the term to which, or the end in respect to which it is given, must be, not some other event of a collateral nature, but the coming or receiving of the possession itself. Then, while these objections apply to the common view, there is no need for resorting to it; while it does violence to the word, it only obscures the sense. Εις περιποιησι, both Œcumenius and Theophylact on 1 Pet. ii. 9, hold to be, εις κτησιν, εις κληρονομιαν, for a possession, for an inheritance. And Didymus on the same place, as quoted by Steiger, says, "that is περιποιησις, which, by way of distinction, is reckoned among our substance

persons, but our goods; not what believers in their souls and bodies are to be hereafter, but what is prepared for their enjoyment. For the inheritance which belongs to a person, must always be separate from the person himself; and as that, which is called an inheritance in the one clause, is undoubtedly the same with that, which in the other is named a possession, purchased or acquired, but not yet redeemed, the redemption of the possession must be a work to be accomplished *for* us, and not to be wrought *in* us; it must be a change to the better effected, not upon our persons, but upon the outward provision secured for their final happiness and well-being.

It is true, that the church of God, the company of sound and genuine believers, is sometimes called the inheritance or purchased possession of God. In Old Testament scripture his people are styled his "heritage," "his treasure;" and in New Testament scripture we find Peter addressing them as "a peculiar people," or literally, a people for a possession—namely, a possession of God, acquired or purchased by the precious blood of his dear Son. The question here, however, is not of what may be called God's inheritance, but of ours; not of our redemption from the bondage of evil as a possession of God, which he seeks to enjoy free from all evil, but of that, which we are ourselves to possess and occupy as our final portion. And as we could with no propriety be called our own inheritance, or our own possession, it must be something apart from, and out of ourselves, which is here to be understood, —not a state of being to be held, but a portion of blessing and glory to be enjoyed.

Now, whatever the inheritance or possession may be in itself, and whatever the region where it is to be enjoyed, when it is spoken of as needing to be redeemed, we are evidently taught to regard it as something that has been alienated from us, but is again to be made ours; not a possession altogether new, but an old possession, lost, and again to be reclaimed from the powers of evil, which now overmaster and destroy it. So was it certainly with our persons; they were sold under sin; with our loss of righteousness before God, we lost, at the same time, our spiritual freedom and all that essentially belonged to the pure and blessed life, in the possession of which we were created. Instead of this we became subject to the tyrannous dominion of the prince of darkness, holding us captive in our souls to the foul and wretched bondage of sin, and in our bodies to the mortality and corruption of death. The redemption of our persons is just their recovery from this lost and ruinous state, to the freedom of God's children, and the blessedness of immortal life in his presence and glory. It proceeds at every step by acts of judgment upon the great adversary and oppressor, who took advantage of the evil, and ever seeks to drive it to the uttermost; and when the work shall be completed by the redemption

and possessions." Therefore, the correct meaning here is that given by Calov: "Περιποιησις, the abstract being placed for the concrete, is to be understood of the acquired inheritance, for the Holy Spirit is the pledge and earnest unto the full redemption of the acquired inheritance."

of the body from the power of the grave, there shall then be the breaking up of the last bond of oppression that lay upon our natures,—the putting down of the last enemy, that the son of wickedness may no longer vex or injure us.

In this redemption-process, which is already begun upon the people of God, and shall be consummated in the glories of the resurrection, it is the same persons, the same soul and body, which have experience both of the evil and of the good. Though the change is so great and wonderful, that it is sometimes called a new creation, it is not in the sense of any thing being brought into existence, which previously had no being. Such language is simply used on account of the happy and glorious transformation, that is made to pass upon the natures, which already exist, but exist only in a state of misery and oppression. And when the same language is applied to the inheritance, which is used of the persons of those who are to enjoy it, what can this indicate, but that the same things are true concerning it? The bringing in of that inheritance, in its finished state of coming fulness and glory, is in like manner called "the making of all things new;" but it is so called only in respect of the wonderful transformation, which is to be wrought upon the old things, which are thereby to receive another constitution, and present another aspect, than they were wont to do before. For that the possession is to be *redeemed*, bespeaks it as a thing to be recovered, not to be made,—a thing already in being, though so changed from its original destination, so marred and spoiled, overlaid with so many forms of evil, and so far from serving the ends for which it is required, that it may be said to be alienated from us, in the hands of the enemy from the prosecution of his purposes of evil.

Now, what is it, of which this can be affirmed? If people say heaven, and mean by that, what is commonly understood, some region far removed from this lower world, in the sightless realms of ether, then, I ask, was heaven in that sense ever man's? Has it become obnoxious to any evils from which it must be delivered? or has it fallen into the hands of an enemy and an oppressor, from whose evil sway it must again be redeemed? None of these things surely can be said of *such* a heaven; it would be an altogether new inheritance, a possession never held, consequently never lost, and incapable of being redeemed. And there is nothing that answers such a description, or can possibly realize the conditions of such an inheritance, but what lies within the bounds and compass of this earth itself, with which the history of man has hitherto been connected both in good and evil, and where all the possession is, that he can properly be said either to have held or to have lost.

Let us throw ourselves back to the commencement of things, and ask, what was man's original inheritance, when formed in his Creator's image, and placed in that sphere which God designed him to occupy? His being endowed with God's likeness, replenished with the powers of a holy and blessed life, and possessed of faculties which fitted him for high service and communion with Hea-

ven, all this belonged merely to the constitution of his person; in naming such things, we just speak of the kind of being that man then was; but the inheritance he possessed must have been something different—and what was it? What, indeed, could it be but the earth itself? of which it is said, that "the Lord hath given it to the children of men," (Ps. cxv. 16.) Man's original inheritance was a lordship or dominion, stretching over the whole earth, but extending no farther; entitling him to the ministry of all creatures within its borders, and the enjoyment of all fruits and productions upon its surface—one only excepted, for the trial of his obedience, (Gen. i. 28—31, Ps. viii.) When he fell, he fell from his dominion, as well as from his purity; the inheritance departed from him; he was driven from paradise, the throne and palace of his kingdom; labour, servitude, and suffering became his portion in the world; he was doomed to be a bondsman, a hewer of wood and drawer of water, on what was formed to be his inheritance, and all that he has since been able, by hard toil and industry to acquire, is but a partial and temporary command over some fragments of what was at first all his own.—Nor is that the whole. For with man's loss of the inheritance, Satan was permitted to enter, and extend his usurped sway over the domain, from which man has been expelled as its proper lord. And this he does by filling the world with his instruments of evil and works of darkness,—spreading disorder through the elements of nature, and disaffection among the several orders of being,—above all, corrupting the minds of men, so as to lead them to cast off the authority of God, and to use the things he confers on them for their own selfish ends and purposes, for the injury and oppression of their fellow-men, for the encouragement of sin and suppression of the truth of God, for rendering the world, in short, as far as possible, a region of darkness and not of light, a kingdom of Satan and not of God, a theatre of malice, corruption and disorder, not of love, harmony and blessedness.

Now as the redemption of man's *person* consists in his being rescued from the dominion of Satan, from the power of sin in his soul, and from the reign of death in his body, which are the two forms of Satan's dominion over man's nature; what can the redemption of the *inheritance* be, but the rescuing of this earth from the manifold ills, which through the instrumentality of Satan have come to lodge in its bosom,—purging its elements of all mischief and disorder,—changing it from being the vale of tears and charnel-house of death, into a paradise of life and blessing,—restoring to man, himself then redeemed and fitted for the honour, the sceptre of a real dominion over all its fulness,—in a word, rendering it in character and design what it was on creation's morn, when the sons of God shouted for joy, and God himself looked with satisfaction on the goodness and order and beauty which pervaded this portion of his universe? To do such a work as this upon the earth, would manifestly be to redeem the possession which man by disobedience forfeited and lost, and a new title to which has been pur-

chased by Christ for all his spiritual seed; for were that done, the enemy would be completely foiled and cast out, and man's proper inheritance restored.

But some are perhaps ready to ask, is that, then, *all* the inheritance that the redeemed have to look for? Is their abode still to be upon earth, and their portion of good to be confined to what may be derived from its material joys and occupations? Is paradise restored, to be just the re-establishment and enlargement of paradise lost? We might reply to such questions by putting similar ones regarding the persons of the redeemed. Are these still, after all, to be the same persons they were during the days of their sojourn on earth? Is the soul, when expatiating amid the glorious scenes of eternity, to live in the exercise of the same powers and faculties which it employed on the things of time? And is the outward frame in which it is to lodge and act and enjoy itself, to be that very tabernacle which it bore here in weakness, and which it left behind to rot and perish in the tomb? Would any one feel at a moment's loss to answer such questions in the affirmative? Does it in any respect shock our feelings, or lower the expectations we feel warranted to cherish concerning our future state, when we think that the very soul and body which together constitute and make up the being we now are, shall also constitute and make up the being we are to be hereafter? Assuredly not; for however little we know what we are to be hereafter, we are not left in ignorance, that both soul and body shall be purged of all evil; and not only so, but in the process shall be unspeakably refined and elevated. We know it is the purpose of God to magnify in us the riches of his grace by raising our natures higher than the fall has brought them low—to glorify while he redeems them, and so to render them capable of spheres of action and enjoyment beyond, not only what eye has seen or ear has heard, but even what has entered into the mind of man to conceive.

And why may we not think and reason thus also, concerning the inheritance which these redeemed natures are to occupy? Why may not God do a like work of purification and refinement on this solid earth, so as to transform and adapt it into a fit residence for man in glory? Why may not, or rather, why *should* not that, which has become for man as fallen, the house of bondage and the field of ruin, become also for man redeemed the habitation of peace, and the region of pre-eminent delight? Surely He, who from the very stones can raise up children unto Abraham, and *will* bring forth from the rotting corruption of the tomb forms clothed with honour and majesty, can equally change the vile and disordered condition of the world, as it now is, and make it fit to be "the house of the glory of his kingdom,"—a world, where the eye of redeemed manhood shall be regaled with sights of surpassing loveliness, and his ear ravished with sounds of sweetest melody, and his desires satisfied with purest delight,—aye, a world it may be, which, as it alone of all creation's orbs has been honoured to bear the footsteps of an incarnate God, and witness the perform-

ance of his noblest work, so shall it be chosen as the region, around which he will pour the richest manifestations of his glorious presence, and from which, perhaps, he will continually send, by the ministry of his redeemed, communications of love and kindness to the farthest bounds of his habitable universe!

Oh! no, it is not, when rightly considered, a low and degrading view of the inheritance which is reserved for the heirs of salvation, to place it in the possession of this very earth, which we now inhabit, after it shall have been redeemed and glorified. I feel it for myself to be rather an ennobling and comforting thought; and were I left to choose, out of all creation's bounds, the place where my redeemed nature is to find its local habitation, enjoy its Redeemer's presence, and reap the fruits of his costly purchase, I would prefer none to this. For if destined to so high a purpose, I know it will be made in all respects what it should be,—the very paradise of delight, the very heaven of glory and blessing, which I desire and need. And, then, the connexion between what it now is, and what it shall have become, must impart to it an interest, which can belong to no other region in the universe. If any thing could enhance our exaltation to the lordship of a glorious and blessed inheritance, it would surely be the feeling of possessing it in the very place where we were once miserable bondsmen of sin and corruption. And if any thing should dispose us to bear meekly our present heritage of evil, to quicken our aspirations after the period of deliverance, and to raise our affections above the vain and perishable things around us, it should be the thought, that all we can now either have or experience from the world is part of a possession forfeited and accursed, but that it only waits for the transforming power of God to be changed into the inheritance of the saints in light, when heaven and earth shall be mingled into one.

But if this renovated earth is to be itself the inheritance of the redeemed—if it and no other is to be the heaven, where they are to reap life everlasting, how, it may be asked, can heaven be spoken of as above us, and represented as the higher region of God's presence? Such language is never, that we are aware of, used in Scripture to denote the final dwelling-place of God's people; and if it were used there, as it often is in popular discourse, it would need, of course, to be understood with that limitation, which requires to be put upon all our more definite descriptions of a future world. To regard expressions of this kind, just referred to, as determining our final abode to be over our heads, were to betray a childish ignorance of the fact, that what is so by day, is precisely the reverse of what is so by night. Such language properly denotes the superior nature of the heavenly inheritance, and not its relative position. God can make any region of his universe a heaven, for that is heaven where he manifests his presence and glory; and why might he not do so here, as well as in any other part of creation?—But is it not said, that the kingdom, in which the redeemed are to live and reign for ever, was prepared for them before the foundation of the world; and how, then, can the scene of

it be placed on this earth, still waiting to be redeemed for the purpose? The preparation there meant, however, cannot possibly be an actual fitting up of the place which believers are to occupy with their Lord; for wherever it is the apostle tells us it still needs to be redeemed; in that sense it is not yet ready; and Christ himself said, in reference to his leaving the world, that he was going to prepare it, which he does by directing, on his throne of glory, the events which are to issue in its full establishment. Still, from the first, it might be said to be prepared, because destined for Christ and his elect people in the mind of God, even as he was himself "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;" and every successive act in the history of the mediatorial kingdom is another step toward the accomplishment of the purpose.—Are we not again told, however, that the earth is to be destroyed, its elements made to melt with fervent heat, and all its works consumed? Unquestionably this *is* said—though not by any means necessarily implying that the earth is really to be annihilated. We know that God makes many changes pass over the works of his hands, but that he actually annihilates any, we have no ground, either in nature or in Scripture, to suppose. If in the latter we are told of man's body, that it perishes, and is consumed by the moth, yet what can be more certain, than that it is not doomed to utter destruction, but shall live again? When we read of the old world being destroyed by the flood, we are at the same time assured, that the material fabric of the earth continued as before. Indeed, much the same language that is applied to the earth in this respect, is also extended to the heavens themselves; for they too are represented as ready to pass away, and to be changed as a vesture, and the promise speaks of new heavens, as well as a new earth. And in regard to this earth in particular, there is nothing in the language used concerning it to prevent us from believing, that the fire which, in the day of God's judgment, is to burst forth with consuming violence, may, like the waters of the deluge, and in a far higher respect than they, act as an element of purification—dissolving, indeed, the present constitution of things, and leaving not a wreck behind of all we now see and handle, but at the same time rectifying and improving the powers of nature, refining and elevating the whole framework of the earth, and impressing on all that belongs to it a transcendent, imperishable glory—so that in condition and appearance it shall be substantially a new world, and one as far above what it now is, as heaven is above the earth.

There is nothing, then, in the other representations of Scripture, which appears, when fairly considered, to raise any valid objection against the renovated earth being the ultimate inheritance of the heirs of promise. And there is much to shut us up to the conclusion that it is so. We have enlarged on one testimony of inspiration, not because it is the only, or the chief one on the subject, but because it is so explicit, that it seems decisive of the question. For an inheritance, which has been already acquired or purchased, but which must be redeemed before it can be really our possession,

can be understood of nothing but that original dominion, which sin brought along with man, into the bondage of evil at the fall. And of what else can we understand the representation in the eighth Psalm, as interpreted by the pen of inspiration itself, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. ii. 5—9, and in 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28? These passages in the New Testament put it beyond a doubt, that the idea of perfect and universal dominion, delineated in the Psalm, is to be realized in the world to come, over which Christ, as the head of redeemed humanity, is to rule, with his people in him and under him. The representation itself in the Psalm, is evidently borrowed from the first chapter of Genesis, and considered as a prophecy of good things to come, as a prediction of the dignity and honour already obtained for man in Christ, and hereafter to be revealed, it may be regarded as simply presenting to our view the picture of a restored and renovated creation. "It is just that passage in Genesis, which describes the original condition of the earth," to use the words of Hengstenberg, "turned into a prayer for us," and we may add, into an object of hope and expectation. When that prayer is fulfilled, in other words, when the natural and moral evils entailed by the fall have been abolished, and the earth shall stand to man, when redeemed and glorified, in a similar relation to what it did at the birth of creation, then shall the hope we now possess of an inheritance of glory, be turned into enjoyment. In Isa. xi. 6—9, the final results of Messiah's reign are in like manner delineated under the aspect of a world, which has obtained riddance of all the disorders introduced by sin, and is restored to the blessed harmony and peace which characterized it, when God pronounced it very good. And still more definitely, though with reference to the same aspect of things, the Apostle Peter, (Acts iii. 21,) represents the time of Christ's second coming as "the time of the restitution of all things," that is, when every thing should be restored to its pristine condition,—the same condition in kind, all pure and good, glorious and blessed, but higher in degree, as it is the design and tendency of redemption to ennoble whatsoever it touches.*

It is precisely on the same object, a redeemed and glorified earth, that the Apostle Paul, in the 8th chap. of the Romans, fixes the mind of believers as the terminating point of their hopes of glory. An incomparable glory is to be revealed in them, and in connexion with that, "the deliverance of a suffering creation from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." What can this deliverance be, but what is marked in the Epistle to the Ephesians, as "the redemption of the purchased possession?" Nor is it possible to connect with any thing else, the words of Peter in his second Epistle, where, after speak-

* That this is simply the force of the original here, it may be enough to give the meaning of the main word from the lexicographer Hesychius: αποκαταστασις, "is the restoration of a thing to its former state, or to a better; restitution, consummation, a revolution of the grander kind, from which a new order of things arises, rest after turmoil."

ing of the dreadful conflagration which is to consume all that belongs to the earth in its present form, he adds,—as if expressly to guard against supposing, that he meant the actual and entire destruction of this world as the abode of man,—"Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

It is only by understanding the words of Christ himself, "the meek shall inherit the earth," of the earth in that new condition, its state of blessedness and glory, that any full or adequate sense can be attached to them. He could not surely mean the earth as it then was, or as it is to be during any period of its existence, while sin and death reign in it. So long as it is in that condition, not only will the saints of God have many things to suffer in it, as our Lord immediately foretold, when he spake of the persecutions for righteousness' sake, which his people should have to endure, and on account of which he bade them look for their "reward in heaven;" but all the treasure it contains must be of the moth-eaten, perishable kind, which they are expressly forbidden to covet, and the earth itself must be that city without continuance, in contrast to which they are called to seek one to come. To speak, therefore, as many commentators do, of the tendency of piety in general, and of a mild and gracious disposition in particular, to secure for men a prosperous and happy life on earth, is quite beside the purpose as regards the fulfilment of the promise, that they shall "inherit the earth." If it could even command for them the whole that earth now can give, would Christ on that account have called them *blessed?* Would he not rather have warned them to beware of the deceitfulness of riches, and the abundance of honours thus likely to flow into their bosom? To be blessed in the earth as an inheritance, can only import, that the earth has become to them a real and proper good, such as it shall be, when it has been transformed into a fit abode for redeemed natures. All which is further confirmed, and apparently rendered as clear and certain as language can make it, by the representations constantly made by Christ and the inspired writers, of his return to the earth and manifestation on it in glory, as connected with the final scenes and issues of his kingdom. When he left the world, it was as a man going into a far country, from which he was to come again; (Matth. xxv. 14; Luke xix. 12; John xiv. 3;) the heaven received him at his resurrection, but only until the times of the restitution of all things; (Acts iii. 21;) the period of his residence within the vail, is coincident with that during which his people have to maintain a hidden life, and is to be followed by another, in which they and he together are to be manifested in glory. (Col. iii. 4; Heb. ix. 28; 1 John iii. 2; Rev. i. 7.) And in the book of Revelation, while unquestionably the scenes are described in typical language, yet when exact localities are mentioned as the places where the scenes are to be realized, and that in connexion with a plain description of the condition of those who are to have part in them, we are compelled by all the ordinary rules of composition to re-

gard such localities as real and proper habitations. What, then, can we make of the ascription of praise from the elders, representatives of a redeemed church, when they give glory to the Messiah, as "having made them kings and priests unto God, and they shall reign with him upon the earth?" Or, what of the closing scenes, where the evangelist sees a new heaven and a new earth, in the room of those which had passed away, and the new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven to settle on the renovated earth, and the tabernacle of God fixed amongst men? (Rev. v. 9, 10, xx. 1—5.) Granting that the delineations of the book are a succession of pictures, drawn from the relations of things in the former ages of the world, and especially under the Old Testament economy, and that the fulfilment to be looked for is not as of a literal description, but as of a symbolical representation, yet there must be certain fixed landmarks as to time and place, persons and objects, which, in their natures or their names, are so clearly defined, that by them the relation of one part to another must be arranged and interpreted. For example, in the above quotations, we cannot doubt who are kings and priests, or with whom they are to reign; and it were surely strange, if there could be any doubt of the theatre of their dominion, when it is so expressly denominated *the earth.* And still more strange, if when heaven and earth are mentioned relatively to each other, and the scene of the church's future glory fixed upon the latter as contradistinguished from the former, still earth should stand for heaven, and not for itself. As well surely might it be affirmed, that when the name of God occurs there, or Jesus Christ, or the saints, it is not these, but some other objects that are to be understood by them. And, on the whole, we are forced to conclude with Usteri, that "the conception of a transference of the perfect kingdom of God into the heavens, is properly speaking modern, seeing that according to Paul, and the Apocalypse, (and he might also have added, Peter and Christ himself,) the seat of the kingdom of God is the earth, inasmuch as that likewise partakes in the general renovation."*

* The above passage is quoted by Tholuck, on Rom. viii. 19, who himself there, and on Heb. ii., concurs in the same view. He also states, what cannot be denied, that it is the view which has been adopted by the greatest number, and the most ancient of the expositors, amongst whom he mentions, though he does not cite, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Luther, &c. And Rivet, on Gen. viii. 22, states, that the opinion, which maintains only a change, and not an utter destruction of the world, has most supporters, both among the older and the more recent writers, so that it may be called, says he, "the common one, and be said to prevail by the number of its adherents." In the present day, the opposite opinion would probably be entitled to be regarded as by much the most common; and the view here set forth, will perhaps by some be eyed with jealousy, if not condemned as novel. It may be proper, therefore, to give a few quotations from the more eminent commentators. Jerome, on Isa. lxv. 17, quotes Ps. cii. 26 and 27, which he thinks "clearly demonstrates, that the perdition spoken of, is not a reducing to nothing, but a change to the better;" and having referred to what Peter says of the new heavens, and the new earth, he remarks, that the apostle "does not say, we look for other heavens and another earth, but for the old and original ones transformed into a better state." Of the Fathers generally, as of Justin Martyr in particular, Semish states, that they regarded the future destruction of the World by

Having now closed our investigation, we draw the following conclusions from it.

1. The earthly Canaan was neither designed by God, nor from the first was it understood by his people, to be the ultimate and proper inheritance, which they were to occupy; things having been spoken and hoped for concerning it, which plainly could not be realized within the bounds of Canaan.

2. The inheritance was one which could be enjoyed only by those who had become the children of the resurrection, themselves fully redeemed in soul and body from all the effects and consequences of sin, made more glorious and blessed, indeed, than if they had never sinned, because constituted after the image of the heavenly Adam;—and as the inheritance must correspond with the inheritor, it can only be man's original possession restored,—the earth redeemed from the curse which sin brought on it, and, like man himself, rendered exceedingly more beautiful and glorious, than in its primeval state,—the fit abode of a church, made like, in all its members, to the Son of God.

3. The occupation of the earthly Canaan by the natural seed of Abraham, was a type, and no more than a type, of this occupation by a redeemed church, of her destined inheritance of glory; and consequently every thing concerning the entrance of the former on their temporary possession, was ordered so as to represent and foreshadow the things which belong to the church's establishment in her permanent possession. Hence, between the giving of the promise, which though it did not terminate in, yet included the land

fire, "far more frequently as a transformation, than as an annihilation." (Life and Times of Justin, Bib. Cab. Vol. XLII. p. 366.) Calvin, while he discourages minute inquiries and vain speculations regarding the future state, expresses himself with confidence, on Rom. viii. 21, as to this world being the destined theatre of glory, and considers it as a proof of the incomparable glory to which the sons of God are to be raised, that the lower creation is to be renewed for the purpose of manifesting and ennobling it, just as the disorders and troubles of creation have testified to the appalling evil of our sin. So also Haldane, one of the last persons to run after a novelty, on the same passage, after quoting from 2 Pet. and Rev., continues: "The destruction of the substance of things differs from a change in their qualities. When metal of a certain shape is subjected to fire, it is destroyed as to its figure, but not as to its substance. Thus the heavens and the earth will pass through the fire, but only that they may be purified and come forth anew, more excellent than before. This hope —the hope of deliverance—was held out in the sentence pronounced on man, for in the doom of our first parents the divine purpose of providing a deliverer was revealed. We know not the circumstances of this change, how it will be effected, or in what form the creation—those new heavens and that new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, suited for the abode of the sons of God—shall then exist; but we are sure it shall be worthy of the divine wisdom, although at present beyond our comprehension." To the same effect Fuller, in his Gospel its own Witness, ch. v. These quotations may suffice to vindicate our view regarding the renovated earth, as being itself the promised inheritance, from the charge of novelty, seeing it is substantially held by many of the most eminent commentators. If they have not followed out their views in the manner and to the extent we have done, this can make no material difference. Mr. Stuart, in his work on Romans, expresses his strong dissent from such views, on the ground of their being opposed to the declarations of Christ, and requiring such a literal interpretation of prophecy, as would lead to absurd and ridiculous expectations in regard to other predictions. We can find no contrariety in our opinion to any declarations of Christ or his apostles, and the other predictions he refers to belong to quite another class, and do not require, or even admit, as we shall show in the Appendix, of a strictly literal fulfilment.

of Canaan, and under that infolded the prospect of the better inheritance, a series of important events intervened, which are capable of being fully and properly explained in no other way, than as having a typical bearing on the things hereafter to be disclosed respecting that better inheritance. If we ask, why did the heirs of promise wander about so long as pilgrims, and withdraw to a foreign region, before they were allowed to possess the land, and not rather, like a modern colony, quietly spread, without strife or bloodshed, over its surface, till the whole was possessed? Or, why were they suffered to fall under the dominion of a foreign power, from whose cruel oppression they needed to be redeemed, with terrible executions of judgment on the oppressor, before the possession could become theirs? Or, why before that event also should they have been put under the discipline of law, having the covenant of Sinai, with its strict requirements and manifold obligations of service, superadded to the covenant of grace and promise? Or, why again should their right to the inheritance itself, have to be vindicated from a race of occupants, who had been allowed for a time to keep possession of it, and whose multiplied abominations had so polluted it, that nothing short of their extermination could render it a fitting abode for the heirs of promise? The full and satisfactory answer to all such questions, can only be given, by viewing the whole in connexion with the better things of a higher dispensation,—as the first part of a plan, which was to have its counterpart and issue in the glories of a redeemed creation, and for the final results of which the church needed to be prepared by standing in similar relations, and passing through like experiences, in regard to an earthly inheritance. No doubt, with one and all of these, there were connected reasons and results for the time then present, amply sufficient to justify every step in the process, when considered simply by itself. But it is only when we take the whole as a glass, in which to see mirrored the far greater things, which from the first were in prospect, that we can get a comprehensive view of the mind of God in appointing them, and know the purposes which he chiefly contemplated.

For example, the fact of Abraham and his immediate descendants, being appointed to wander as pilgrims through the land of Canaan without being allowed to occupy any part of it as their own possession, may be partly explained, though in that view it must appear somewhat capricious, by its being considered as a trial to their own faith, and an act of forbearance and mercy toward the original possessors, whose iniquities were not yet full. But if we thus find grounds of reason to explain why it may have been so ordered, when we come to look upon the things which happened to them, as designed to image the things which were afterwards to distinguish the relation of God's people to a higher and better inheritance, we see the absolute necessity of those earlier transactions being so ordered, and how it would have been unsuitable for the heirs of promise, either entering at once on the possession, or living as pilgrims and expectants, any where but within its borders. For

thus alone could their experience fitly represent the case of God's people in gospel times, who have not only to wait long for the redemption of the purchased possession, but while they wait, must walk up and down as pilgrims in the very region which they are hereafter to use as their own, when it shall have been delivered from the powers of evil, who now hold it in bondage, and purified from their abominations. Hence, if they know aright their relation to the world as it now is, and their calling as the heirs of promise, they must sit loose to the things of earth, even as the patriarchs did to the land of their sojourn,—must feel, that it cannot be the place of their rest, so long as it is polluted, and that they must steadfastly look for the world to come as their proper home and possession. And thus also the whole series of transactions, which took place between the confirmation of the covenant of promise with Jacob, and the actual possession of the land promised, and especially of course the things which concerned that greatest of all the transactions, the revelation of the law from Sinai, is just to be regarded as a delineation in the type, of the way and manner in which the heirs of God are to obtain the inheritance of the purchased possession. Meanwhile, apart from these later transactions, there are two important lessons, which the church may clearly gather from what appears in the first heirs of promise, and which she ought never to lose sight of:—First, that the inheritance, come when and how it may, is the free gift of God, bestowed by him, as sovereign lord and proprietor, on those whom he calls to the fellowship of his grace: And, second, that the hope of the inheritance must be received as an animating principle into their hearts, influencing all their procedure; they must in spirit and character be seekers, as in condition they are heirs, of that better country, which is a heavenly; and Christ is never truly formed in the heart at all, until he be formed as "the hope of glory."

APPENDIX.

ON THE BEARING WHICH THE RELATION THE FAMILY OF ABRAHAM HELD IN RESPECT TO THE EARTHLY INHERITANCE, HAS ON THE QUESTION OF THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE.

THE latter part of our investigations necessarily brought us to the edge of this question; and if some application were not made of the views that have been unfolded toward its solution, the subject would be left in an unsatisfactory state. The typical relations of Abraham and his posterity, in this respect, have been represented thus: Their possession of the land of Canaan was a pledge and type of the inheritance of the redeemed and glorified earth, conferred in Christ on the whole of his elect church. This seems to contemplate the heirs of salvation at large as equally interested in the antitypical Canaan, and to exclude the seed of Israel from any special pre-eminence in regard to it. Are they, then, to have no farther connexion with the earthly Canaan? And does it follow, from the view taken of their former relation to it, that they stand on a footing with men of other nations, in respect to the inheritance of the purchased possession? Are they heirs of it merely in the same sense and to the same extent, in so far as they become children of faith?

In replying to such questions, it is to be observed at the outset, that if there be any soundness in the principles of typological interpretation we have endeavoured to establish, there can be no propriety in the representation not unfrequently made by recent writers on unfulfilled prophecy, that the original possession of the land of Canaan by the seed of Jacob was "only a token and earnest of a more glorious occupation of the land hereafter to be enjoyed by them."* It is against the very nature of predictions of this sort, as determined by the history of previous fulfilments, to make an event foreshadow itself—to make one occupation of the land of Canaan the type of another and future occupation of it. The type is a fact in providence, or an institution in religion on a lower and earthly ground, embodying the principles which were to re-appear in something of a corresponding, but much higher nature in the kingdom of God. The natural Israel inheriting an earthly possession, can never, therefore, with truth be regarded as typifying a recurrence of the same event, in however improved and altered circumstances; and as well might it be alleged, that the natural Israel's having eaten manna in the desert was a type of their eating manna again in some more glorious manner, or that their former killing of the passover foreshadowed their doing so hereafter in some new and higher style, as that their ancient occupation of the land of Canaan prefigured some future and more glorious possession of it.

In truth, the very same considerations which would lead us to regard the former occupation of Israel as typical of another and better one, would also infer the re-establishment of that economy under which they held pos-

* Israel Restored, in Twelve Lectures, by Clergymen of the Church of England,

session of Canaan, the rebuilding of the temple, the resuscitation of the Levitical priesthood, the revival of sacrifices, and the services generally which were ordained by the law of Moses. This is now, we believe, not only admitted, but contended for by most of those who entertain the opinion we have been controverting; they hold, that the more glorious occupation of the land of Canaan by Israel shall be succeeded by a more glorious celebration of the Old Testament worship; and in doing so, they have only followed to its legitimate results the idea, that the former possession of Canaan was typical of another—for if that former possession bespoke a future one, the establishment of the religious economy connected with it must also have bespoke its own future restoration. We feel, however, when this is maintained, as if an indescribable confusion were spread over the whole field of inquiry, as if the first principles of the subject were called in question, and no common ground remained, on which we might stand and hold with them a disputation respecting the future. Not only the entire spirit, but some also of the plainest declarations of New Testament scripture, seem to stand in irreconcilable opposition to the views they advocate. When they tell us, that Jerusalem is again to be what it was in the days of old—the chosen place, where the one temple is to be reared, where the blood of slain victims is to be presented on the altar, and every worshipper is to repair to it for the purpose of offering them, we naturally think of the word of Malachi, that "in *every* place incense shall be offered to the Lord, and a pure offering," and of the assertion of Jesus to the woman of Samaria, "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, shall men worship the Father," that is manifestly, shall not worship him there peculiarly, these places shall possess no distinctive privileges. That the church, in its most advanced and ripened state on earth, when fitted even for enjoying the personal presence of her glorious Lord, should find her proper food and becoming exercises in the imperfect and carnal ordinances, which are represented by the apostle as suited only to men in bondage, or in the comparative childhood of their religious being, from which they were to escape like the heir on completing his minority, (Gal. iii. 24—26, iv. 1—6,) appears to us an incongruity utterly inexplicable. And when we read further in New Testament scripture concerning the law of Moses, that the abolition of that hand-writing of ordinances was among the benefits procured for the church by the death of Christ—that to return to its services is to attempt to honour God by acts of will-worship, (Col. ii. 16—23,)—that for any one to insist on their observance now is as much as to make void the work of Christ, and cut themselves off from the hope of his salvation, (Gal. iv. 9, 10, v. 4—8,)—that the law, which ordained such services, was of necessity changed and disannulled by the introduction of a new priesthood after the order of Melchisedec, or the establishment of a new and better covenant, (Heb. vii. 12—18, viii. 7—13, ix. 1—14;)—when we put all these things together concerning the law of Moses, and consider how, in contra-distinction to it, the church of Christ is constantly represented as henceforth the temple of God, true believers its only priesthood, and their spiritual exercises its real sacrifices, we cannot see how it is possible to retain our faith in the testimony of evangelists and apostles, and at the same time believe, that the law commanding the seed of Abraham to offer animal sacrifices has never been abrogated, that it is even now binding upon them, and that it is again to be restored in all its rigour amid the glories of the new Jerusalem.*

* It may, perhaps, be thought by some, that an exaggerated view is here given of the sentiments entertained by the writers referred to, on unfulfilled prophecy. They may satisfy themselves, however, that this is far from being the case, by looking, for example, into Fry on Unfulfilled Pro-

It might have been thought, that the plain and irreconcilable contrariety, which the views now stated regarding the typical relations of ancient Israel, carry to the explicit declarations of New Testament scripture, would have proved an effectual bar against their reception. It is not a very promising indication of the present state of biblical science, that they have already obtained, it is said, an extensive belief, and are still, in some quarters at least, making progress. We conceive it utterly hopeless to argue with persons, who can set at naught such clear testimonies of Scripture, and believe it would be vain to attempt convincing them of the unsoundness of their mode of understanding the typical relations of Old Testament things. For they seem to have lost sight of the very first elements of typological interpretation. Thus Fry deliberately states, "that the ceremonial rites enjoined by the covenant (of Sinai,) besides being 'shadows of good things to come,' were endowed, by the ordination of God, with a certain virtue and efficacy for the purification of earthly things, and sanctified to the purifying of the flesh," p. 191. Why, it was the very circumstance of their being ordained to effect these carnal purifications, which fitted them for being typical of gospel things; these were not two separate ordinations, but in serving the one purpose, they at the same time served the other, and without their instrumentality to purifyings of the flesh, they could not possibly have been "shadows of good things to come." It is impossible to reason, where there is no common ground to stand upon; and merely referring to the first part of our investigations for such proof as can be given of the soundness of our own principles, we must content ourselves at present with briefly re-stating the New Testament view of Israel's typical relations. The natural Israel, who were chosen to be God's peculiar property out of all the nations of the earth, were types of the elect seed, the royal priesthood, whom Christ was to choose out of the world to his kingdom and glory. When this latter purpose began to be carried into effect, the former of necessity began, as a shadow, to pass away, just as the shedding of Christ's

phecy, sec. 10—12, or the Second Coming of Christ, by Twelve Ministers of the Church of England, Lect. IX. In the latter it is affirmed, in flat contradiction, as appears to me, to the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that "God ordained sacrifice to be observed by the circumcision, until the covenant made with the circumcision shall cease; and as this law has never been abrogated, it is not unreasonable to suppose, that sacrifices might now be employed as spiritual acts of worship by the Jews," p. 277. And Fry, speaking of the new covenant mentioned by Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and other prophets, says, "It has been a great mistake among Christian divines to confound the provisions of this national covenant, to be made with the Israelites of the last days, with the salvation of the remnants according to the election of grace under the gospel dispensation," p. 196; and again, "It is very evident, that the holy ceremonial of religious worship to be established at Jerusalem and Mount Zion, is to resemble more the former service of the tabernacle, than the solemnities of the Christian worship, and that it is to be for all the remnants of the nations that are spread over all the earth. There is but one holy mountain, one temple," &c., pp. 235, 238. I profess myself utterly at a loss to understand how any one, with the Epistle to the Hebrews in his hand, could speak of the opinion noticed in one of these quotations as a mistake of Christian divines; for there the covenant of Jeremiah is expressly declared to be the new or Christian covenant, as opposed to the old or Jewish. The palpable, and sometimes almost direct contradictions, which such authors give to the inspired writers of the New Testament, is to my mind so flagrant, that it surpasses my comprehension how any person, who believes in the inspiration of all Scripture, should be guilty of them. Thus, to give just another example, the Lecturer already quoted boldly avers, that "the advent of Christ in humiliation, had the effect of setting the hearts of the children against the fathers," and goes on to show how different it is to be at the coming of Elias, p. 256. Of course, the conclusion is irresistible, that what the angel foretold John was to do (Luke i. 17) utterly failed, and precisely the reverse took place. It is surely also a very different account of Paul's reason for circumcising Timothy, from what is given in the word of God, when he is alleged to have done so, "because his mother was a Jewess, and that the ceremony was binding on him, being a Jew," p. 280; and Paul himself, it seems, observed certain customs of the law, not to silence the foolish clamours of his countrymen, but for his own "spiritual edification," p. 279.

blood upon the cross swallowed up the whole body of sacrifices appointed by the law. Hence, to indicate that the type in this respect had passed into the antitype, believers in Christ, of Gentile as well as Jewish origin, are called Abraham's seed, (Gal. iii. 29,) Israelites, (vi. 16, Eph. ii. 12, 19,) comers unto Mount Zion, (Heb. xii. 22,) citizens of the free or heavenly Jerusalem, (ib., Gal. iv. 26,) the circumcision, (Phil. iii. 3, Col. ii. 11,) and in Revelation, which is written throughout in the language of type and symbol, they are even called Jews, (chap. ii. 9,) and the sealed company in chap. vii., who are the representatives of the Christian church, at a certain period in the Roman empire, are identified with "the twelve tribes of Israel."

This being the case, the possession of the land of Canaan by the natural seed of Abraham, which, as a type, could only foreshadow the possession by Christ's elect seed of the everlasting inheritance, must be reckoned among the things which are past and gone, from the time that this seed came to assume a separate and substantive being in the world, and was called to the "hope of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." Accordingly, when Christ's kingdom was really introduced, it was to this inheritance, and to it alone, that the hopes and expectations of the heirs of salvation were pointed. Paul never so much as alludes to any other, though he often treats of the case of the Jew, and expressly handles the subject of their conversion to the Christian faith. And though Peter, in his first Epistle, professedly writes only to converts from Judaism, the one inheritance, which he represents them as called to hope for, is that glorious one, free from all corruption and decay, "which is reserved in heaven for those who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." The possession of that inheritance, this, and nothing else, will constitute the fulfilment in the kingdom of God of the typical relation, which was held by ancient Israel to the land of Canaan. And the former existence of such a relation affords no more warrant for expecting the re-occupation of that particular land by them, than Adam's original occupation of the garden of Eden brought any warrant to him, after the promise of recovery entered, that he should possess anew the identical garden with its tree of life, or than Noah's preservation in an ark amid the waters of the deluge, embodied a prediction of some future, more terrific deluge, coupled with a more glorious ark.*

* It may be proper, before leaving this part of the subject, to give another specimen of the confusion prevalent with the writers already referred to, on the relation between type and antitype. The author of one of the Lectures in Israel Restored, p. 193, speaking of the new covenant mentioned in Jer. xxxi., says, "Do they tell us the literal Israel was a type of the spiritual? We instantly grant it. Do they tell us again, that therefore there is a spiritual fulfilment of the covenant to believers? We grant it also. (We might remark in passing, on the abuse of the term *spiritual* here—as if a real experience of the blessings promised, to the very letter of the promise, though in the case of persons different from those to whom it was immediately made, constituted a properly spiritual fulfilment.) But all this, we say, is nothing to the point. You must go farther. What you need to prove is, that Israel of old, whose descendants still exist, was *so* a type of the spiritual Israel, that they were finally to merge, and be lost in them whom they typified." There is no need for any such proof, for *as types* they of necessity merged and became lost in the antitype. Was not the paschal lamb merged and lost in Christ? And the vail of the temple in Christ's flesh? And David in the Son of Mary? In short, every type must be merged and lost in its antitype, when this actually arrives.—Of a similar nature is another statement in the same page, "Israel in the wilderness can in no sense be called the fathers of the present gospel church." Why not? If the apostle was right in calling the members of that church "children of Abraham," surely they must be children also of Abraham's immediate descendants. And if he was likewise right in representing the New Testament church as growing out of the Old, a branch of the same stem, or the same child only sprung to manhood, the parentage of the later Jewish church must also have been the parentage of the Christian. The same ground, which makes the Old Testament types merge into the gospel antitypes, makes the fathers of the one church merge into those of the other; viz., the essential identity of the church under both dispensations.

This, however, by no means settles the question as to the restoration of the Jews to the land of their fathers. It only disposes of one ground, on which it is sometimes injudiciously based and advocated. The typical relation of the natural seed to that land, does not by itself require, or properly admit of, such a restoration; for in so far as that is concerned, an antitype of another and higher kind is needed to satisfy the conditions of the type,—the possession of a heavenly, everlasting inheritance, and that by the whole multitude of the redeemed. At the same time, it is quite possible, that there may be reasons connected with the future purposes of God, which require the restoration of the Jews as a people to their ancient territory, and that though this is not involved in their original connexion with Canaan, it may be predicted with sufficient clearness in the word of prophecy, to render it a matter of well-grounded expectation. It must, therefore, be determined by a fair and candid examination of the prophecies bearing on the subject,—an examination, which, notwithstanding all that has been written on it, has not, so far as we know, been yet made in a correct and satisfactory manner. We might have abstained from entering on such an examination, as the determination of the question is not essentially connected with that branch of our inquiry, from which we have taken occasion to raise it; for that, as we have seen, points in another and higher direction. But as it is in itself a matter of considerable interest, and especially as the prophecies which refer to it, form one of the most numerous and important class of examples, in which the typical relation of the Old Testament furnished the pattern, and the language for delineating the events of the New, we cannot be regarded as taking up either an unseasonable or a profitless line of inquiry.

In entering upon this investigation, we must first of all endeavour to ascertain the leading principles that ought to guide our inquiries. We perfectly accord with the oft-repeated, but frequently misapplied maxim of Hooker, that "where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is generally the worst." It is rather too brief, however, to be of much service in the interpretations of prophecy, and may with almost equal facility be applied to serve the purpose, either of a false, or of a sound exposition. The principle is more safely and properly expressed by Vitringa: "It is an indispensable canon of interpretation, in regard to divine, as well as human writings, that we must not, without solid and necessary reasons, depart from the primary, proper, and grammatical sense, which the genuine signification of the words and phrases, the circumstances of time and action, and the occasions and scope of the words uttered by the prophets present to the reader; that is, it must only be done, when attributes are connected with subjects, which, in the primary and proper sense, are not suitable to them, for reason then obliges us to go farther, and to think of an analogous subject."* One can make something of the principle, when embodied in a canon like this, but very little of it, as laid down by Hooker, in prophetical inquiries. For the language of prophecy has so much to do with the figure, it takes its shape and hue so much from the circumstances and occasions out of which it arose, and from its very nature and design it so necessarily required to be wrapt in a certain measure of obscurity, that an interpretation according to the letter, strictly so called, is very rarely applicable to the word of prophecy. For example, the first prophecy, which gave the tone to the general style of the prophetic record, was delivered in the language of symbol, such as was naturally suggested by the occasion and circumstances, which called

* Vitringa Præf. ad Lectorem in Com. in Isa. p. 16.

it forth: The serpent having appeared as the agent of evil, and the adversary both of God and man, he is regarded as the permanent representative and head of a cause opposed to the purposes of Heaven, and the best interests of mankind. And it is only in this point of view, that the prediction about the existence of an enmity between the woman's seed and the serpent's, and the bruising of the heel in one case, and of the head in the other, can be intelligibly read and correctly understood. The nearest letter is by no means, in such a case, the most just and faithful exhibition of the truth; but, in conformity with the canon of Vitringa, the primary, proper, and grammatical sense is to be carefully sought and determined, not simply by giving the natural signification to the words and phrases, but by viewing these in the light of the circumstances of time and action, and the occasion and scope of the prophecy. Thus only can we arrive at its *real import*, which is the main thing, whether men may choose to call it the literal or the spiritual meaning; for the sense, in which these terms are now applied, is "infinitely ambiguous." Whatever the true and substantial meaning of any prediction, as fairly determined in the manner above stated, is, in that and no other way are we to look for its fulfilment. And in the case of the prophecy just referred to, the thing really predicted undoubtedly was,—that a conflict was henceforth to be maintained between two parties of opposite characters and designs; that in this conflict the offspring of the woman, comprehending all who should not apostatize to the interest of the adversary, should sustain considerable, though not mortal injury; but that the opposite party should receive in the issue an irrecoverable and fatal blow. (The prophecy, of course, enclosed a promise of Christ, but only as pre-eminently the woman's seed, in whom all the others were to have their life, and power, and victory.)

This, then, we take as our chief canon or principle of interpretation for guiding us to the understanding of the true and proper import of the prophecies, and consequently for enabling us to ascertain the kind of events, in which their fulfilment is to be expected. But in regard to the prophecies now under consideration, prophecies which point to events, in whole or in part still future, additional light may be derived from its fair and legitimate application to these, by a consideration of those other prophecies, which have already met with their fulfilment. Mr. M'Neile has justly stated, as a general principle, that "the species of interpretation, which events have rendered imperative, as it respects fulfilled prophecies, ought to be adhered to with constancy and candour, in the examination of those prophecies which are as yet unfulfilled."* We must beware, however, lest in searching for light in this direction, we really embrace a shadow; for, like Hooker's maxim, this general principle is capable of being applied so as to mislead. We are not to suppose, that *all* fulfilled prophecies can equally serve the purpose of throwing light on *all* unfulfilled ones. The prophecies compared must themselves be parallel, delivered in like circumstances, and bearing on events of like character, so far alike at least as to belong to the same dispensation. It will not do, for example, to take a prophecy referring to events which had respect only to the Old Testament dispensation, such as Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years' captivity, or Isaiah's prophecy regarding the destruction of the Assyrian army of Sennacherib, and make the fulfilment these received a standard for the interpretation and fulfilment of all future prophecies respecting the Jews and Assyrians, which were to fall out in the dispensation of the New Testament. For however commonly that may be done,

* Lecture on the Jews, Pref. p. 1.

it is not a consistent and candid application of the light furnished by past fulfilments; it is making what was spoken and accomplished under one class of relations, the gauge and criterion for deciding upon what was spoken, and to be accomplished, in regard to another and very different class of relations. The coming of the Messiah, and the introduction of the kingdom of heaven under him, so deeply affected all existing relations and elevated the divine administration so far above its former level, that another rule and measure, than what was observed before, might be expected to hold for what was to come after; and it might be to put the word of prophecy, as it certainly would be to put the word of instruction and encouragement, in bondage, were it ruled precisely by the ancient line of things. The merest babe in theology knows, that while both Old and New Testament worshippers are alike declared to have had the gospel preached to them, to be eaters at an altar, to have their persons purified by the blood of sprinkling, and their bodies washed with pure water, the things meant by such expressions are very different, and much higher in the one case than in the other, the relations being all heightened and enlarged; and to hold the Christian to the Jewish measure in this respect, were to confound things that most materially differ, and grossly to misapprehend the real meaning of scripture. Now, as the necessity for this elevation and enlargement arises from the very nature of the change, which Christianity has brought into the condition of the church and economy of God, we have reason to expect, that it must also have affected, in a like ratio, the utterances and anticipations of prophecy, as regards the two periods respectively. So that the fair and consistent application of the principle in question, would lead us—not to set up a prediction, which ran out in the one period, as the criterion in all respects for determining the sense and fulfilment of a prediction running out into the other—but to take such prophecies as have certainly had their fulfilment, wholly, or in part, in the earlier objects and events of the Messianic kingdom, and by such fulfilment to judge of what may justly be expected to satisfy the conditions of those prophecies which seem to point to objects and events still future. For thus only do we compare like with like, and bring properly related or corresponding parts of the divine plan into juxta-position with each other.

Now there is a class of predictions of considerable number, which may be ascertained by clear, well-defined, and, we may say, indubitable marks, to have entered on their fulfilment certainly not later than the first age of the gospel; if they had not received their accomplishment before, they must *then* at least have begun to do so—unless they have been attended with absolute failure. This, we know, cannot have been the case; and, therefore, in looking into the prophecies which respect the state and destinies of the later Jews, the commencement ought clearly to be made with those which must at the latest have met with their accomplishment at the threshold of the Christian era — that by first carefully ascertaining their import, as compared with the necessary fulfilment, we may be prepared for judging of others less definite in their meaning, and more indeterminate as to their fulfilment.

We can have no hesitation in referring to the class of prophecies now in question, the prophecy of Jeremiah, for the fulfilment of which Daniel prayed in Babylon: "For thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the Lord; thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end. Then shall ye call upon me, and I will

hearken unto you. And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart. And I will be found of you, saith the Lord; and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the Lord; and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive," (ch. xxix. 10—14.) The express mention of the period of seventy years from the Babylonish captivity, as the era when this visitation of mercy and promise of return should begin to take place, leaves no room to doubt that the restoration spoken of is the one already past. And there are two peculiarities, which must be carefully noted, in the terms of the predicition, as furnishing a key for the proper interpretation of similar language when it occurs elsewhere. 1. It speaks of other countries besides Babylon as the regions from which the captives were to be brought back, "all nations," and "all places," whither they had been driven. 2. It speaks of a *general* result—the return of the nation as such to the land of their fathers, and their sincere, hearty return also to the God of their fathers. The prophet expressly states that they were *then*, at the expiration of the seventy years, to seek and to find God—to search for him with all their heart,—and to be gathered from all nations whither they had been driven.

Now it is matter of fact, attested by the word of God himself, especially in Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah, that only a remnant after all did the things here mentioned; many of them preferred living in Babylon, and in other places, after the call and the opportunity was given them to return; and of those who did listen to the call, and avail themselves of the opportunity, the severe reproofs contained in the last three prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, that in many there was a grievous mixture of selfishness and hypocrisy, and that the men of real faith and piety were comparatively few. How, then, are we to explain the wide, general, and comprehensive terms of the prediction? So far as the first point is concerned, very little explanation is required; for, if rightly considered, the language will be found to carry scarcely even the appearance of contradiction to the facts of the case. For though we speak of the Babylonish exile, and the restoration from Babylon, our language in this respect is by no means strictly correct; Babylon did not in reality comprehend all the exiles, nor did the restored come merely from her borders. Those who were carried by the proud conqueror direct to Babylon, evidently formed but a portion, probably the smaller portion, of the whole multitude that were dispersed; many thousands fled elsewhere, as is manifest from the judgments pronounced against Edom, Tyre, Gaza, &c., for their cruelty in intercepting and cutting off, or delivering up some of these miserable fugitives, (Amos i. 6—9, Obad. 12;) while of those who did fall into the hands of the conqueror, many would no doubt be settled in other parts of the empire. Besides, the decree of Cyrus, which permitted and even enjoined the rebuilding of the temple, and the return to Palestine, although it might be said to bear more immediate reference to the Jews settled in and about Babylon, yet it was by no means confined to them; "the proclamation was made through all his kingdom," and was addressed to "all the people of the God of heaven remaining in any place where they sojourned," (Ezra i. 1—4,) as the decree of Artaxerxes also was made "for all the people of Israel, and the priests, the Levites, in his realm," (chap. vii. 13,)—decrees and proclamations obviously comprehensive of the house of Israel, as well as of the house of Judah, and clearly implying that the persons invited to share in its privileges were most widely scattered. Hence also Zechariah speaks of them as having been "scattered among all the nations whom they

knew not," ch. vii. 14. How far the invitation was accepted by the dispersion belonging to the house of Israel, we have no exact means for determining; we only know, that some from that house did return and joined themselves to the house of Judah, so that at the dedication of the temple a sin-offering of twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel, was offered for all Israel, as if all were alike interested in the service, (Ezra vi. 17.) All which conclusively shows, that the first dispersion was to many countries, as well as Babylon, and that in so far as the call on the part of God, and liberty on the part of the people, were concerned, there was no restriction, the whole remnant of the natural Israel, wherever they might be located, both could and should have returned.

In point of fact, however, they did not; they did not all return, nor did the whole of those who actually returned search for the Lord with all their hearts, and find him in truth. How, then, do we here, where the second peculiarity above noticed comes in, reconcile the terms of the prophecy with the facts of the case? Shall we take refuge in what is called a spiritual sense? By no means. The prophecy has but one fair and proper meaning, and in that it has unquestionably been fulfilled. *Has been*, we say, for referring as it does so expressly to the circumstances connected with the return from the Babylonish exile, it would be a mere quibble and evasion to transfer it to any other period of the church's history. It is true, that in the prophecy God addresses Israel as such; but making mention, as it specially does, of spiritual as well as temporal blessings, are we thereby warranted to infer, that the whole of the natural Israel, then surviving were included? Is it not a principle running through all the history of God's dealings, in connexion with such promises, that the elect seed alone are viewed as the heirs of promise, and that if others share with them in the fulfilment as to the temporal part of what is promised, it is only as the mixed multitude from Egypt shared with Israel at first—that is, only by way of indulgence, and not as included in the word and purpose of God? That, we assert, is the principle on which the prophecy is to be explained—a principle which pervades the whole word of prophecy, in so far as it contains promises of life and blessing to his church. The eye of God in such cases ever rests, not upon the visible and professing, but the elect and real portion of the church; and when he speaks, it is as if none but they were to be accounted of. Thus, to give only a few examples:—in the first promise he spake generally of the seed of the woman as going to bruise the head of the serpent, although it was to be only an elect seed, and pre-eminently one individual of that seed, that was to do so; the promise of Canaan was made to Abraham's posterity at large, although it was from the first intended to be limited to the line of Isaac, and even to an election out of that seed; so also the promises made to this elect seed, as to their inheritance of privilege and blessing in Canaan, such as Ex. xix. 5, 6, Deut. xxviii. 1—24, xxxiii. were made to them and verified in them, no farther than as they were true children of God,—though expressed in the most general and comprehensive terms, yet to these alone were they properly addressed, these alone attained to the full and actual experience of what they predicted, and in so far as others partook with them it was merely as retainers, whose place secured for them a portion in the common goods and liberties of the house, while the children of promise kept theirs; in like manner, the prophecy of Joel ii. 28, &c., concerning the outpouring of the Spirit on all flesh, yet fulfilled, as Peter expressly tells us, Acts ii. 16, in the case of an elect and believing remnant, as, indeed, it never could fairly be understood to mean by all flesh, any but those who were children of the Spirit. Of the same kind also are many promises or de-

clarations of good to be experienced in the New Testament, such as John viii. 28, xii. 32, where the principle we speak of appears in what may be called its strongest form, Christ making promise of results from his being lifted up on the cross, as to all without exception, while, from the very nature of the case, a limited number only must have been understood,—the whole, but no more than the whole of those, with whom, as the crucified Saviour, he should properly have to do.

There is another prophecy in Jeremiah nearly related to the one we have been considering, and with it also another modification of the principle just unfolded. It is the prediction contained in ch. xxiv. 5—7, where, after having shown Jeremiah the two baskets of figs, the one very good, and the other very bad, the Lord declares: "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, like these good figs, so will I acknowledge them that are carried away captive of Judah, whom I have sent out of this place into the land of the Chaldeans for their good. For I will set my eyes upon them for good, and I will bring them again to this land; and I will build them, and not pull them down, and I will plant them, and not pluck them up. And I will give them a heart to know me, that I am the Lord; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; for they shall return unto me with their whole heart." There is a speciality in this promise, which compels us to refer it to the events connected with the restoration from Babylon; for the Lord speaks of following the persons addressed into the land of the Chaldeans, and bringing them up again with remarkable tokens of his favour. And the contrast, which is so expressly drawn between their case, and that of the others, whom the evil figs represented, and whom the curse of the Lord was to pursue even in the land of their captivity, ver. 8—10, manifestly shuts us up to the necessity of understanding the promise of a restoration from the captivity then impending, and puts out of the question a far distant, final, and universal restoration. This is rendered still more certain by a comparison of ch. xlii. 10, where the same things are promised, and in the very same words, to the remnant that were left in the land after the captivity had been carried away, if they would but seek the Lord. Yet of the Jewish people, as having the promise of that first restoration, it is said, that they should have a heart to seek and know the Lord, and that he would build them and not pull them down, plant them and not pluck them up. How shall we account for such language, considering the turn and issue, which matters ultimately took with them? Would not the fair and natural import of the words have led us to expect a different result? Undoubtedly it would, if viewed simply in itself, as a promise addressed to the whole people, and without respect to the spiritual condition, in which they might come to be placed. But God never made any such absolute and unqualified promises of good; they are all given, as has been already said, to the real children of faith, who alone have a heart to receive them; and not only so, but in giving them to these, God always has respect to his own kind and gracious propensions, without for the most part taking into account any perverse and wilful obstinacy on the part of the heirs of promise, which may possibly arise to check the flow of his goodness. Such contingent and future obstinacy, and its inevitable results, are not contemplated in the declaration he gives of his purposes, which are propounded without limitation or reserve, to show how large the goodness of the Lord is to his people, and how safely it may be reckoned on by them, so long as their heart is steadfast toward him. Every prophecy in the Bible might be brought under the category of this principle, in so far as it holds out the prospect of blessings stretching onwards for a long while to come; and, in particular, we may refer, besides the one before us,

to such promises as that in 2 Sam. vii. 16, comp. with Amos ix. 11, or Ps. lxxxix. 38—45, which both indicate a partial failing on account of sin in what was originally promised in the most unqualified terms, having respect to the kind and benevolent intentions of God; Deut. xxxiii., and the promises generally which were given to Israel regarding the good he was to experience after his establishment in Canaan, which were commonly expressed in the most absolute and comprehensive terms, but, at the same time, were always understood to bear respect to the holy ends for which Israel was called to inherit the land, and to be susceptible of a more or less accurate fulfilment, according as those ends were served or otherwise, so that in times of great defection the Lord did not hesitate to speak of breaking his promise or covenant with them, Numb. xiv. 34, Zech. xi. 10; or again in Mal. ii. 4—9, where, after declaring the divine purpose to reject and cast off the priests and Levites, the prophet holds it to be a keeping of the covenant with Levi, in the proper sense, on God's part, and charges them with a breach of it through their wickedness. Of the same nature, and requiring substantially the same explanation, are the general promises of unqualified blessing given to the righteous and his seed; such as Ps. i. xxxvii., Jer. xvii. 7, 8, &c.; and on the other side, such absolute and peremptory threatenings as those addressed to Nineveh in Jonah, or to Tyre and the cities of the Philistines, which, proceeding on the supposition of an existing state of wickedness, might either be wholly averted by a timely repentance, or, at least, in the case of a godly remnant, might be changed into blessings, (comp. Zech. ix. 7, Isa. xxiii. 18.*)

It is by thus viewing the above predictions of coming good, in connexion with the every where recognised, if not expressed, distinction between the real and merely professing church, a church prepared to fulfil the high ends for which it was called, and a church not so, that we get at the true bearing and import of them. For we thus obtain an important element for determining, if not the purport of the predictions themselves, yet the range or circle within which their fulfilment was fairly and legitimately to be expected. And even if we could have offered a less satisfactory explanation, the facts of the case would still have been sufficient to prove, beyond a doubt, our substantial correctness as to the meaning; for if the event in providence has not falsified the word in prophecy, it must be understood in a way, which admits of a fulfilment being found in the affairs connected with, and subsequent to, the restoration from Babylon. But we thus cut off a series of conclusions, which are constantly drawn by certain writers on prophecy, from other predictions of a similar nature—in which, for example, it is foretold, that the people of Israel or Judah, or both, are to be brought from all countries whither they had been driven, and settled again

* It was the mistake of the backsliding Jews in former times, as it is of not a few writers in the present times, to overlook these limitations connected with God's promises to them, and to suppose that the promises were made to them absolutely and merely as the natural Israel. On the contrary, God made no promises to the natural Israel as such; they one and all proceeded on the supposition, that the children were to have the heart, as well as the name of the parents, and only in so far as they were so had they the least warrant to look for the fulfilment of what was promised. Then, but then only, were they children of the covenant, the real Jacob, as they are called in Ps. xxiv. 6, ("the generation who seek thy face—Jacob," i. e. truly Jacob,) or the peculiar treasure, as in Ex. xix. 6, ("if ye obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then," &c. comp. with Mal. iii. 17, where the small remnant of faithful men, who feared the Lord and thought upon his name, are called the peculiar treasure, the jewels, as opposed to the great mass of the people, who were of an opposite spirit, and who, by the appropriation of that name to the others, are virtually declared to have been on the same footing with the heathen.) If we do not thus view God's purposes and promises of grace to his ancient people, as made to them in so far merely as they were a true seed of God, in so far as the inward corresponded with the outward election, we can read none of them aright.

in the land of their fathers. We are told, that this must imply a future restoration, because they have never yet been gathered from all countries, and that it was only a partial restoration of Judah and Benjamin, with a few scattered members of the other tribes, which returned at the expiration of the Babylonish exile. If this be a correct inference—if it proceed on a sound principle of interpretation, then it is obvious, that the prediction of Jeremiah, which expressly promised a gathering from all countries, and a settled occupation in the land, after seventy years' exile, must have failed. Or, such a prophecy as that in Jer. xxxiii. 7 is taken, where the Lord promises to build them as at the first, and the conclusion is drawn, that there must be a future restoration to accomplish it; while such a *must*, such a necessity, can only be proved on a principle, which would disprove the truth of what, in much stronger terms, was predicted by the same prophet, at ch. xxiv. 6, of what should take place at the end of the seventy years. Or once more, the prediction in Jer. xxiii. 6 is selected, which speaks of the righteous Branch, that was to be raised up to David, the King that was to reign and prosper, and of whom it is said, "that in his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our righteousness." And it is argued, that there must be a future restoration of the natural Israel, in order to verify this title of Christ; because, though Christ is made to his people righteousness, yet his being so "is stated only to the ear and heart of faith;" it is not universally acknowledged, nor confessed to by all even in the professedly Christian church. "Besides, the speaker is a Jew; the subjects of the king just mentioned in the preceding words are Jews; and the plain construction of the passage requires, that the pronoun *our* be referred to the Jews; so that the prophecy declares the name, by which the king shall be called amongst his Jewish subjects in those days, to be Jehovah our Righteousness. Now, have the Jews acknowledged Jesus of Nazareth as Jehovah their righteousness?"* It is Mr. M'Neile's own admitted principle, that "the species of interpretation, which events have rendered imperative, as it respects fulfilled prophecies, ought to be adhered to with consistency and candour in the examination of those prophecies which are as yet unfulfilled." Let us, then, just take one of those other prophecies already cited from Jeremiah, one of a parallel nature to that above commented on, the prediction in ch. xxix., which unquestionably is, or at least should be a fulfilled prophecy, and we know not by what possible ingenuity the species of interpretation required for the one, can be made to consist with that adopted for the other. The latter prediction expressly states, that at the end of seventy years the Lord would visit his people in mercy, and, among other things, that they should "search for him with all their heart," and that they should "be gathered from all the nations and places, whither they had been driven." But were they indeed so gathered? Was it not a comparatively small number after all? And did they then, as a people, so search for the Lord? Even of those who returned, was it not a mere remnant that did so? And were not the last three prophets sent with the severest denunciations against the majority of the people for their impenitence, worldliness, and open transgressions? There can be but one answer to these questions, and only one of two conclusions drawn from it,—either that this prediction has utterly failed, or that the species of interpretation adopted in the above quotation in regard to the other, is not that which is warranted, much less rendered imperative, by the fulfilment that is past.

There are other prophecies in Jeremiah, which with no less certainty

* M'Neile's Lectures on the Jews, p. 171, third edit.

than those already considered may be referred to the post-Babylonish period for their fulfilment. Of this kind is the prediction in ch. xxxii., which, by the symbolical action of Jeremiah's buying his cousin's field, and the explanation subsequently delivered regarding it, made promise of a return from a Babylon, and the usual transactions of merchandise thence arising, as in a quiet and settled country. That it must be understood of an early return, is evident from the care taken to preserve the evidences of Jeremiah's purchase, as instruments that would be required in the course of a generation or two; from the introduction to the main part of the prophecy, which specified the Lord's visiting them in Babylon, as the period of coming mercy, ver. 5; and from the special mention of the land of Benjamin, the places about Jerusalem, and the cities of Judah, as again to be possessed, implying that the return intended was to be one more especially of the two tribes. That the prophecy also speaks of their being gathered from other countries, having one heart to fear the Lord, and living under a sure and perpetual covenant of blessing, ver. 37—41, is in perfect accordance with the predictions already considered, and is to be explained on the same principles. We might also mention the prophecy in the next chapter, as one that must have begun to receive its fulfilment in the affairs connected with the return from Babylon, as appears from the localities specified in ver. 13, which were to be re-occupied, and which are the same as in ch. xxxii.; but as in the second part of it, the prophet goes on to foretell, in plain terms, of Christ's kingdom, we postpone the consideration of it till afterwards. The prophecy in ch. xvi. 14, 15, also, evidently refers to the period of the return from Babylon, but calls for no particular remark.

In Zechariah we find language used of the restored people and their reviving commonwealth, very similar to that contained in the predictions of Jeremiah; and we pass on to his statements, as the next in order to those we have been examining. In ch. i. 16, the Lord declares, that he "was returned to Jerusalem with mercies," and that not only should his house be again built in it, but "his cities should yet through prosperity be spread abroad," and he would "yet comfort Zion and choose Jerusalem." In ch. ii. 4, the prophet is assured, that "Jerusalem should be inhabited (or rather, should dwell) in towns without walls, for the multitude of men and cattle therein." Such a great increase and flow of prosperity would be given to her, that the ancient boundaries would be quite insufficient to contain them; and so near would the Lord dwell to her, so gracious and faithful would he be in His dealings to her, that he would be himself "a wall of fire round about, and the glory in the midst of her." And that this referred, not to some far distant period and altogether different era in the church's history, is evident from the circumstances in which the word was delivered, being designed to comfort the afflicted remnant, and, still more conclusively, from the call immediately addressed to the children of Zion, to make haste and "deliver themselves from the land of the north, and from the winds of heaven, whither they had been driven," ver. 7. Then follow intimations to the effect, that in consequence of the Lord's having returned to choose Jerusalem and manifest in her his glory, the nations of the earth would be restrained from doing them harm, and not only so, but would "be joined to the Lord and become his people," ver. 8—11.*

* Mr. Fry (on Unfulfilled Prophecy, pp. 6, 7) says, that what is here written "cannot be wholly applied to the concerns of that remnant, which returned from Babylon." And he produces two reasons; 1. It is predicted after the vision at the close of chap. 1st, which represented the four horns of the Gentiles, which scattered Judah, as cast out; and this never having been completely done, the other cannot have been fully realized. If there be any thing in this, all

Again, in ch. viii., the Lord begins with declaring his jealousy for Zion, and says, "I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; and Jerusalem shall be called a city of truth, and the mountain of the Lord of hosts, the holy mountain." The populous and flourishing state of Jerusalem is then described, ver. 4 and 5; and, conscious that such prospects were fitted to provoke a smile of unbelief or ridicule, from the extreme contrast they presented to the existing desolations, the Lord asks, ver. 5, "If it be marvellous in the eyes of the remnant of this people in these days, should it also be marvellous in mine eyes?" He declares it to be his purpose "to bring his people from the east and from the west, and make them dwell in the midst of Jerusalem," and that "they should be his people, and he their God, in truth and in righteousness," ver. 7, 8. Then follows an exhortation to the people, who were engaged in building the temple, to be strong and of good courage, for the Lord was going to deal differently with the residue of his people from what he had done before they began to build, that he would make their land prosperous, and themselves, "both the house of Judah and the house of Israel, a blessing." He had thought good to punish them when their fathers provoked him by their sins, but now, says he, "I have thought *in these days* to do well unto Jerusalem and to the house of Judah," ver. 9—15. Commands are next given to hate sin and do good, and to keep the statutes of God—clearly implying, that thus only could they now, as always, secure the promised blessings, which disobedience would inevitably alienate from them, however definitely guarantied. And then, as the result of the whole, it is foretold, that other nations, and the inhabitants of other cities, should yet vie with each other in going to seek and pray before the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem; and that, so great should be the regard cherished toward the Jew, and so evident the blessing which rested on him, that as many as ten men of other tongues would be found taking hold of the skirt of his garment, and saying, "We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." The whole is evidently a continuous line of prophecy, containing a series of promised blessings to the good portion of the returned captives, as the threatenings delivered in the preceding chapter were addressed to the hypocritical and bad portion. And that "the primary, proper, and grammatical sense" of the prediction was designed to have its fulfilment in the state of things then being, and afterwards to arise in connexion with that second city and temple, is clear from two indubitable

the visions in the first six chapters must be consecutive, and, of course, the coming of Christ, the Branch foretold in ch. iii., and the removal of Zerubbabel's difficulties, promised in ch. iv., must be postponed till after Israel has been restored, and God has made himself a wall of fire around Zion—consequences which may safely be left to speak for themselves. The visions in these chapters are not consecutive, but all distinct, each complete in itself, and having its fulfilment in a separate, and sometimes contemporaneous, order of events. 2. But he gives it as another reason, that the "effectual protection, described in ver. 5, has never yet been afforded to Jerusalem since the restoration from the Babylonish captivity." An *actual* protection from violence and desolation may surely be called an effectual one, and such God did give to Jerusalem, so long as he continued to dwell in it,—subject only to such temporary and partial exceptions as were necessary for the chastisement of sin. The prophecy simply expresses God's gracious intentions toward Jerusalem in her renovated state; but these intentions, like all others unfolded in the word of promise, might be modified or thwarted in experience by the growth of sin among her people, (see the instances already produced at p. 301.) And if this page of prophecy is not a sibylline leaf—if the prophet is to be regarded as speaking here to plain and unsophisticated men, we hold it to be impossible, from the notes of time clearly indicated, that they would have understood him to speak of any state of things, but that following the return from Babylon. He calls them to leave that place *instantly*, because the Lord was *now* returned to dwell in Jerusalem, and would be a wall of fire around her. What must have been the effect of such language but to deceive, if the protection was not to be effectually given for some thousand years to come?

marks: 1. From the mention of "these days" in the portion, ver. 9—15, the *now* and *henceforth* so pointedly stated, in contrast to the *then* and in *former days*. 2. From the reference in ver. 19, to the fast days, which had been set apart in commemoration of, and in humiliation for, the different stages of God's judgments towards them by the hand of the Babylonians—the laying siege to Jerusalem, the capture of the city, the burning of the temple and their other fine buildings, and the slaying of Gedaliah, causing the dispersion of the remnant that had still been left, (comp. Jer. lii. 4, 6, 7, 12, 13; 2 Kings xxv. 25.) It was in connexion with one of these, that the prophecy in the 7th and 8th chapters was delivered—the fast of the fifth month, kept on account of the destruction of the temple, and which the people thought might now be discontinued, as the new temple was, in the good providence of God, well nigh finished. They, therefore, sent to inquire at the priests and prophets in the temple concerning this matter, ch. vii. 1, 2, on which the prophet delivers a twofold message, one of severe reproof and solemn warning to the hypocritical portion of the people, to the effect that they had never yet properly fasted to the Lord, because they were still at heart wedded to the sins which had provoked the judgments of Heaven, and that they had reason to fear a repetition of the punishments inflicted on their fathers; but in the other, which occupies the whole of the 8th chapter, he speaks to the better portion, and does so in words of the greatest promise and encouragement. And in ver. 19, he tells them, that so happy would be the change, which the Lord was going to bring over their affairs, that those days of fasting would become days of joy and gladness—which could only be said, of course, in reference to the Jerusalem then existing, and the state of things immediately in prospect.

We shall speak to the fulfilment of the above prophecy, after we have produced another of a somewhat similar nature from a different prophet. Meanwhile, let the fact be borne in mind, that whatever the fulfilment may be, it must, if the prophecy has proved true, have already taken place; and by this let us judge what account is to be made of the conclusions often so confidently drawn from other prophecies, less definite and precise as to the time when the fulfilment was to be expected, but precisely similar in language and import. Thus Isa. i. 26—28, Zech. xiv. 20, 21, and many such, are brought forward, in which it is declared, that Jerusalem was not only to be rebuilt and inhabited anew, but to be filled with righteousness, and be emphatically a holy city; and it is affirmed, that as this has never been literally verified in the history of Jerusalem as a whole, another Jerusalem has yet to be built, in which that character will be fully realized.* If such conclusions be well founded, it is manifest, that we must have one principle for interpreting such prophecies, and another for the one before us,—or, as that cannot be admitted, that if they can only stand by the future establishment of such a universally holy city, this has not been verified. For of the Jerusalem built after the return from Babylon, the Lord expressly said, that "he *had* returned to it, that he would dwell in it, that it should be called, a city of truth, a holy mountain," &c. But if this was a true prediction, and has been verified in its real import, and if there is only one species of interpretation for prophecies already fulfilled, and prophecies yet future, those other prophecies referred to, supposing them to be still future, cannot absolutely require a third Jerusalem, having all its people holiness to the Lord.

The other prophecy to which we referred, belonging to a different prophet, is the eminent one in Hag. ii. 6—9; "For thus saith the Lord of

* Israel Restored, p. 218; and all writers of the same views.

Hosts, Yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of Hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of Hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts; and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts." It is now admitted, we believe, by all expositors of competent learning and judgment, that what is here rendered "the desire of all nations," cannot refer to Christ personally. It was so understood by Jerome, who explained it as meaning "the person desired by all nations," (desideratus cunctis gentibus.) He was followed by many of the older interpreters. Calvin, however, even in his day, though he did not altogether reject this view, and raised no objection against it on philological grounds, yet seeing how ill it suited the connexion, preferred understanding the words, "of the nations coming and bringing with them whatever was precious, to consecrate it to the worship of God; they would not come empty, but would collect all their treasures, as a sacred offering to God." Hengstenberg has so thoroughly investigated the subject in his Christology, that it is scarcely possible for any one, who candidly considers what he has written, to entertain a doubt of the inapplicability of the expression to the person of Christ,—although that by no means destroys, as Davison insinuates, the Christian sense of the prediction.* Sack thus briefly states the two reasons, which conclude against such a personal reference: "It cannot denote the Messias, partly because of the plural, (it is literally, the desires, or rather, as Hengstenberg shows, the beauties—the beautiful, precious, or glorious things of the nations,) partly on account of the connexion, according to which the shaking of the heathen, and the filling of the temple with silver and gold requires, חמדת, (desires or beauties,) to be taken in the sense of, 'precious things of the heathen.' This is confirmed by the passage, Hosea xiii. 15, and Neh. ii. 9, where vessels of desire (or beauty) are spoken of; also 1 Sam. ix. 20."† If any thing can be reckoned certain about this remarkable prophecy, it is the necessity of finding its fulfilment in the affairs connected with that second temple; for the things which were to happen are all viewed in immediate reference to "this house,"—the temple then in process of erection. Its mean outward appearance, as compared with that of Solomon, had filled the people with desponding thoughts, who naturally regarded it as a fair indication of what their condition generally was to be. But the prophet comes forth in the name of the Lord to assure them that it was to be the centre of a power and influence far beyond what ever Solomon's attained to, that the surrounding heathen nations, shaken from their carnal security by mighty commotions, would come to it, bringing with them their silver and gold and precious things, and that not only should its glory exceed that of the first temple, but it should become in the highest sense a scene and centre of peace. A flowing of the nations to Jerusalem, a free and liberal contribution of their wealth and glory to the temple of God there, and the ratification, while it stood, of the covenant of peace, properly so called, are what the prophet Haggai clearly warranted the church to expect some time, at least, before that state and constitution of things passed away, which commenced at the restoration from Babylon.

Before speaking to the true interpretation of this prophecy and the preceding one, we may just advert to the ground, which this one point concerning it, viz. its clear and palpable reference to the affairs connected with,

* Davison on Prophecy, p. 329.

† Apologetik, p. 300, 2d Ausg.

or growing out of the second temple, provides for convicting of falsehood, the species of interpretation, which is applied to a parallel class of prophecies,—of which the 60th chapter of Isaiah may be taken as the most eminent example. The delineation given there, is entirely of a piece with the prophecy in Haggai. For what are its leading features? The erection of a city and temple surpassingly beautiful and glorious, to which the nations of the earth bring their contributions, vieing one with another in their endeavours to advance the work, and to lavish on it what is most rare, precious, and costly, and which the Lord also distinguishes with his peculiar presence and blessing. The vision is a mere extension and filling up of the outline, which is drawn by Haggai, (as also still more briefly by Zech. ii. 11,) where, as we have seen, a temple filled with glory, sought unto and adorned by the heathen nations and blessed with the peculiar manifestations of God's presence and goodness, are promised to those who waited for the consolation of Israel after the return from Babylon, and in connexion with the state of things then existing, or immediately in prospect. Now if the delineation in Isaiah imperatively demands a future restoration of Israel, and stands over till then for its fulfilment, the conclusion is inevitable, that the parallel delineation in Haggai must in like manner stand over for the same. But what, then, becomes of the faithfulness of God, and the veracity of his prophet, who expressly joined those coming glories to that second temple, and on that ground alone proclaimed its superiority to the first? To transfer these glories to some future temple, not to be built till thousands of years after the second one had been laid in ruins, is as much as to say, that they were put by the prophet in the wrong place, and that as spoken by him, a false vision has been given. But if we shrink from such conclusions,—if the prophecy has met with its fulfilment in the past, then there being only one legitimate species of interpretation for like prophecies, whether referring to past or future, it is vain to point to such predictions as that in Isaiah, for conclusive proof of a still coming restoration.*

What, however, is the true mode of interpreting those prophecies in Haggai and Zechariah, by which, as having entered already on their fulfilment, we would rule the interpretation of so many others? Shall we go about to distinguish between a literal and a spiritual interpretation? Not certainly in the sense in which these expressions are commonly understood. For we believe the language has but one primary, proper, and grammatical sense,—only in searching for that, we must not look at the bare words, but, according to the canon of Vitringa, must view them in connexion with the circumstances of time and action, and the evident scope and design of the prophet. We must remember that it is the characteristic of prophecy and promise in general, to take its hue and shape from the occasion and circumstances that gave rise to it, and that we can only get at the real sub-

* To my own mind, this mode of argument appears plain and unanswerable. But in looking into what one sometimes meets with in recent writers on such subjects, I feel as if I wanted some faculty of discernment, which they seem to possess, and which gives them, as it were, a sphere of vision peculiarly their own. Thus, without the least attempt at explanation, or any apparent consciousness of a difficulty being in the way, one of the authors of the Lectures delivered lately in London on the second coming of Christ, quotes the above prophecy from Haggai, and says, "It only preserved some faint traces of that glory, which had set in the destruction of Solomon's temple, and shadowed forth the rising again of that more glorious temple, which shall be built in the days of Messiah. Thus the building commenced by Zerubbabel, a Jew, and finished by Herod, a Gentile, stood for a season as a witness for God, but was finally laid waste till the times of restitution," pp. 252, 253. A witness for God, indeed! In what respect? Certainly not in behalf of the verity of his word, which in that case must have given way, predicting things of the house then erecting which were never realized.

stance by looking through the peculiar type and form, in which it happens for the time to be embodied. Who can fail to discern this in the first prophecy? Is he not fitly taken for an ignorant novice or a shallow unbeliever, who sees there nothing but the outward serpent? That was merely the shell, which the existing circumstances happened to supply, the kernel lies within. And so we may say of, by far the greater part of the delineations given of prospective blessedness and glory,—at least, when the scene is laid in a state of things essentially different from the present. It is under the form and aspect of the present, that the future must then be pictured to our view; for thus only can we obtain any distinct and fitting apprehension of the object in prospect. Thus, the promise is given to a downcast and mourning people, that the Messiah would come to give them "beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness," (Isa. lxi. 3.) Would it not have betrayed childish ignorance of the language and purport of holy writ, for any one to have expected Christ to go about with vessels of oil, and changes of raiment? In like manner, to a people who had long observed days of fasting and humiliation on account of past calamities, the prophet Zechariah holds out the promise, that these days should be turned into seasons of mirth and gladness, on account of the prosperity that should be poured into their lot. Would any one but a simpleton ever think of turning over the pages of history, to learn whether precisely those very days had been set apart and observed as special holydays? The Psalmist declares, that the Lord would rain "fire and brimstone" upon his adversaries, (Ps. xi. 6,) and Isaiah predicts of Idumea, that "its streams should be turned into pitch, and its dust into brimstone," that the land should become "burning pitch, and its smoke go up for ever," (chap. xxxiv. 9, 10.) Do we find any traces of such rain and burnings in history? No, neither should we ever dream of finding them,—for the prophets are manifestly foretelling judgments upon the wicked, with the doom of Sodom and Gomorrah before their eyes, viewing that as a type of what was to come, and throwing it into that form merely to give it a more vivid realization to the mind. Or, to look forward to the still indubitably future world, when we are told of the remembrance-books of the great assize, or a place in Abraham's bosom, or access to the tree of life, in the midst of the paradise of God, or the wearing of a crown of righteousness and glory, and many other things of a like nature,—is it for a moment to be supposed, that the gross reality is what is there to be expected? Is not rather the unseen future clothed in the hue and aspect of what is known and familiar, that the idea may assume in the mind a more vivid and substantial existence? It is for this purpose that prophecy throws its delineations of coming good or evil so much into the form of existing relations, and current or past transactions, which were all so ordered and arranged by God, as fitly to represent and image forth the things that were to be hereafter; and hence the glowing character of those delineations, which, but for such a reference to the present and the past, must have been comparatively cold and lifeless. If we do not bear in mind this characteristic of prophecy, we can never apply to it a uniform principle of interpretation, and we shall be in danger of stumbling at every step.

Let us view the prophecy in Haggai in the light of these remarks, and we shall find no difficulty in understanding its real import. "What was to believers the deepest ground of their distress in beholding the plan of the new temple? Certainly, not that the taste was not satisfied by a beautiful edifice. They beheld rather in the relation of the new temple to the former, a copy of the present relation of God to themselves, a matter-of-fact declaration, that his favour had departed from them, a matter-of-fact prophecy,

that it would not return. From the temple, the existing seat of the divine kingdom, they argued to the nature of the kingdom itself. The distress, therefore, related to what was external, only so far as they regarded it as a copy of what was internal. This form of the distress determined also the form of the consolation. Like the distress, it also had a shell. Without this, it would not have been consolation for them. They stood on the point of view belonging to the Old Testament, under which they lived. To them, as their distress showed, the kingdom of God was inseparable from the temple. God, therefore, caused the assurance to be imparted to them, under the form of a prediction of the glorification of the temple, which they were to be encouraged to build, that he had not rejected his people, that all his promises were ever yea and amen, that his now despised kingdom should hereafter, when his time arrived, surpass all the kingdoms of the world in glory. There is, undeniably, a true divine accommodation, which distinguishes itself from the unjustly praised art, by having to do only with the form of the truth, while that perverts its very essence. This true accommodation runs through all God's deeds and discourses from paradise to Christ, (and we may add, from Christ to paradise again.) What else was it, when he promised to his disciples a hundred-fold more of earthly goods, than they should lose on his account? What else, when he encouraged them by the prediction, that they should sit on twelve seats, judging the twelve tribes of Israel? When he allowed their supposition, that there was such a thing as sitting on his right hand and on his left, and did not correct this form, in which the idea must necessarily be represented, in accordance with their education and spiritual taste, but only their erroneous view regarding the conditions of this honour, which had respect to the essence and was rooted in sin? Or when, without meeting the erroneous physical conceptions, which might in the minds of his disciples be so easily connected therewith, he taught them to pray to a God *in the heavens?* Such an accommodation is found in all that he reveals, either personally, or by his apostles, concerning the state after death, and the kingdom of glory. He gives it to us precisely as the description of the paradisiacal condition, in the form in which we can comprehend it. Should he entirely withhold from us the idea, because it is inconceivable by us in its own proper form? Or, ought we not to speak with children at all of heaven, because we can only speak with them concerning it in a childish manner? Rather, the childish form of the idea is exactly the true one for the child. For only in this form is the idea comprehensible by him. Every other would lead him into error in respect to the very essence."*

We have given the whole of this admirable statement, because it brings more fully out the principle, which must be applied to determine the real sense of this, and many similar prophecies. In fact, on any other principle we must find both promise and prediction failing us at almost every step. Certainly the above prophecy of Haggai must do so, on the ground taken up by recent writers, as well as that occupied by the Jews; for if the idea must have been realized in its very form—if an actual glorification of the temple by the contributions of the heathen nations, in costly and precious things, so as to make it surpass Solomon's, was absolutely necessary, according to the terms of the prophecy, in their more obvious sense, then the destruction of that temple has proved the fallacy of the prediction, and no future temple can possibly verify it. No destruction of it, as Hengstenberg has justly remarked, "could consist with the credibility of the prophet, but one, which according to the idea would be a glorious improvement—a

* Hengstenberg's Christol. on Hag. ii 6—9.

decay, like that of the seed-corn, which perishes in the earth in order to bring forth much fruit." In this sense, but only in this, the prophecy has already received a glorious fulfilment, and will be ever receiving it more and more—though only in the new heavens and the new earth will the truth it unfolds be realized in its fullest magnitude. The temple, considered as the seat and centre of the kingdom in its second stage of development, has been unspeakably glorified. It first of all received Christ, God manifest in the flesh, himself the head of the kingdom, in whom, along with his redeemed church, the temple, so to speak, cast off, like the chrysalis, its exterior form, and was raised aloft to the region of things spiritual and divine. This new and living temple, into which the other had properly risen and merged, and not that outer shell, was henceforth the seat and centre of the kingdom of God; to this the nations have from the first continued to flock, bringing their consecrated gifts; from this the covenant of peace has been perpetually going forth; and when this temple shall be set up in all its glory on the renovated earth, as a place prepared for its reception, nothing shall be wanting to complete the sublime idea of the vision.

The same principle every where appears in the prophecies of Zechariah. We have already referred to his prediction about the fast days being turned into holydays of joy, as one proof. So also in the same chapter must be understood what is said of the flowing of men to the theocracy—which is represented under the form of ten men, out of all languages, taking hold of a Jew's garment and insisting upon going along with him, (to the temple, of course, the seat of the theocracy,) because God was so manifestly with him. Must precisely ten men do this? And must every Jew, like his forefathers, wear long and flowing garments, that he may have breadth of skirt enough to admit of its being done? Shall we not rise above such wretched puerilities, and believe, that the Jew stands there for the representative in every age of the members, as he alone was then a member, of the kingdom of God —that his going to the temple is the outward form of the idea of fellowship and communion with God, arising out of the nature of the Old Testament worship—and that the action of ten men towards him, denotes the passing away of the depression and reproach then resting on the members of the kingdom, and the coming in its stead of the highest honour and enlargement! Such, undoubtedly, is the substance of the prophecy, which is already realized in part, and only waits for the manifestation of the sons of God, to be so in full. In like manner must be understood what is said also, in that chapter, of the character of Jerusalem, as a city of truth, a mountain of holiness—and what is said in Jeremiah to the same effect, both in the passages already quoted and elsewhere. During the time that the temple and Jerusalem stood, and formed the centre of the divine kingdom and worship, there was a partial fulfilment of what in this respect was promised; but only, of course, in so far as it was such a centre, and was the resort of the true covenant-people. Viewing the predictions as promises, it was to these alone that they were made, and in their character and experience alone that the expected good was in any measure realized. But from the moment that Christ was glorified, as the temple and Jerusalem lost their original character, and were no longer the one, the proper dwelling-place of Jehovah, the other, the chosen city—as the Jerusalem and the temple in this sense, that is, as the habitation of God, and the seat of the true religion, then rose heavenwards with its divine Head, waiting the times of restitution, (Gal. iv. 26, Rev. xx. 2,) it is in that higher region, or in the history and destiny of the New Testament church, that we are to look for what yet remains to be fulfilled of such predictions. So long as God's house needed to have an outward and local position upon earth, it continued to have it; he encamped

round about it, according to his own word, drew towards it all his sincere worshippers from every quarter, and made it the fountain of whatever holiness and peace existed in his church; and when Christ came and finished his work, he did not mean to take from his people a centre-place of meeting and fellowship with God, but only shifted its position, so to speak, from earth to heaven, made it independent of time and place, and instead of saying, "You shall find me here," or "go to meet me there," he said, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world," and to the uttermost parts of the earth. So that Zion, considered as the seat of his kingly government, is always a holy mountain, and Jerusalem, as the centre of true worship and holy influences, abides still, and in higher perfection, than before; beyond the reach of accident or violence, it cannot be removed or plucked up for ever.

It would cause us to travel over an immense field, were we to take thus all the passages of prophetical scripture which bear upon the subject before us. But that cannot be necessary, as if once the principle, on which they are to be expounded, is fairly established, there is comparatively little difficulty, or room for difference of opinion in regard to particular examples. We shall, therefore, select only such as more clearly and conclusively bring out the principle; after which, we shall confirm what they establish, by adducing examples of predictions, which the providence of God, the great interpreter of prophecy, has rendered absolutely impossible of fulfilment on any other principle—both in the case of the Jews and in that of other nations and countries.

As a clear and incontrovertible proof of the soundness of view given concerning the temple, chiefly from the prophecy of Hosea, we appeal to the prediction in Zech. vi. 9—15. Here we have Joshua, the high-priest, set up as a type of Christ, and by the action of a crown, (lit. crowns or diadems, but only one, made up of several, to be expressive of a higher dignity, comp. Rev. xix. 12.) formed of the silver and gold brought by the deputies from Babylon, and placed upon the high-priest's head, was signified, what Christ should be and do. He was to be both priest and king, a priest upon his throne; and he should build the temple of the Lord. In predicting this latter part, the words are peculiarly emphatic, "And he shall build the temple of the Lord, even he shall build the temple of the Lord;" as much as to say, "The temple you are now building is but a preparatory and temporary concern—it is only the shell and shadow of what is to be—*the* temple, in its true and proper sense, is to be built by other and nobler hands, it shall be the work of Messiah, though he will admit inferior instruments to share with him in the work—persons that shall come even from the farthest distances, (ver. 15,) and who are represented by these deputies who have come from Babylon, bringing their contributions to aid in erecting this material building." Here we have a word of prophecy given apparently for the express purpose of teaching the church in what sense *the temple* was to be understood, when spoken of in reference to Messianic times. The prophet speaks as if it were that very fabric then in process of erection, which Messiah was to build, while yet nothing can be more certain, than that it is of another and higher kind of edifice that he is discoursing. He is endeavouring, in fact, to get the people to elevate their ideas, as to what the temple or dwelling-place of the Lord must really be;—the habitation of one, who is emphatically a Spirit, it could not fitly be a gross and material framework built by men's hands, but something of a far higher order, composed of living stones, and beautified with ornaments of the Spirit. Such unquestionably is the only house of God Messiah could with any propriety be said to build; and as his doing this is described here as *the building of the temple*, we are furnished with a

striking proof of the principle, that prophecy often writes out its delineations of the future under the shape and aspect of the past, and are prepared to expect similar exemplifications of the principle in other prophecies.

Very similar is the expression, and requiring a similar explanation, found in Dan. ix. 24, respecting the Messiah, "to anoint the Most Holy," or rather, a holy of holies. That this cannot refer to any act of consecration upon the second temple is evident; for even the first temple was not anointed with holy oil, and the Jews themselves admit, that such oil was wanting during the second. Besides the expression in the original here is not *the*, but *a* holy of holies, which is never used of the most holy place in the earthly sanctuary. Neither can it be referred, with many, to the Messiah, for the expression is never used of persons, but always of things, such things as possessed a peculiarly sacred character, and were holy in a higher sense than other holy things,—the altar of burnt-offerings, the vessels in the sanctuary, &c. (see Hengst. in loco.) The Lord commanded Moses to anoint with holy oil the tabernacle and its vessels, as well as the ministering priests, (Ex. xxx. 22, sq. xl. 9, sq.,) and it is well known, that all such anointings were typical of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, (1 Sam. x. 1, 6, xvi. 13, 14, Jas. v. 14, 1 John ii. 20, 27, Acts x. 38, &c.) What is it, then, that at the coming of Christ was to be anointed as a holy of holies, with the gifts and graces of the Spirit? Plainly, the new temple or tabernacle, the church of the living God, which even under the Old Testament was sometimes represented under that appellation, as appears not only from the prophecy last considered in Zechariah, but such passages also as Ps. xv. 1, xxvii. 4, 5, lxxxiv. 4. And much more is the language appropriate now, under the dispensation of the Spirit, which is poured out for the purpose of converting the dead hearts of men into living stones, and building them up as a holy temple to the Lord. At the very time, therefore, that Daniel was foretelling the desolation which was to come over the material temple, he was intimating the consecration of a new and higher one. And speaking, as he thus does, of the church, in language precisely adapted to the material temple, presenting the spiritual idea under that type and form, he teaches us how to understand such language when used elsewhere; in other words, he confirms the principle of interpretation, that when future things are predicted in the shape of past or existing things, it is the reproduction, not of the outward and literal form, but of the inward and essential idea, that is to be expected. We might also adduce in proof of the same from Daniel, what he says in ch. viii. 14, about "the sanctuary being cleansed,"—if that be, as is very commonly thought, a still prospective event. The expression, says a late writer, an advocate for the literal restoration of the Jews, "cannot mean, that the beggarly elements of the Jewish law are to be restored. It must be understood in a gospel sense. The kingdom of God is not meat and drink . . . Applied to the Jews, to whom the passage immediately refers, the cleansing of the sanctuary signifies their conversion to God," &c. (Wodrow, p. 79.) But why natural Jews, if a spiritual sanctuary? Are we to have one species of interpretation for one part of the prophecy, and a different one for another? No; the prophecy is another example of the principle, that not the very form and image, but the essence in a higher style, of Old Testament things is predicted in such language—something bearing the same relation to the New, that they did to the Old Testament church.

Another example may be taken from Zechariah, in a prediction very closely related to that recently explained, ch. iii. 6—10, where Christ is foretold as the antitype of Joshua and his fellows, (that is, the one who should truly and properly fill the priestly office,) and when he should come, the Lord says, he would "remove the iniquity of that land in one day." What land?

Undoubtedly the land of Judea. And why only that? Not, certainly, because the people who dwelt in it should alone experience the benefits of Christ's mediation; but simply, because it was then the proper abode of God's covenant-people, and is hence taken as a fit designation of their abode every where and in all ages. But a more striking and unequivocal example may be found in another vision of Zechariah, that contained in ch. v. 5—11, under the image of a woman, whose name was Wickedness, being put into an ephah, (a measure somewhat less than our bushel, and consequently incapable of holding a female figure without considerable violence,) compressed into it and kept down, by a heavy weight upon the top, and afterwards carried away on the wings of the wind and set down for a permanent dwelling in the land of Shinar or Babylon. It is not the judgment and ruin of Babylon which is here predicted, as our translators have unhappily written in the heading of the chapter; for the punishment threatened is evidently an exile to the land of Shinar, and how could that be predicted of the inhabitants of the land itself? It had been no punishment for them, but the reverse, to be settled and built as a house in the land of Shinar. There can be no doubt that it is the people of Judea who form the subjects of the vision, and who are represented as again growing up to a state of extreme wickedness, first restrained and chastened for their iniquities, and then, when that would not suffice, driven, as before, into a region of banishment. The region is called "the land of Shinar," not as if it were to be that very district, but, in accordance with the principle now under consideration, because that had already been, and was familiarly known, as a land of banishment. The people were going to repeat substantially the wickedness of their fathers, and the doom of their fathers was to be meted to them. The same thing is intimated in plain terms in ch. vii.

Another passage in this prophet may also be referred to, as an unanswerable proof of the prophetic style being what we represent it; that, viz., in ch. xi. 13, which speaks of what was to be done with the thirty pieces of silver, the price at which the ungrateful and wicked people (personified at last in Judas) rated the good Shepherd. "And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter; a goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord," i. e. cast them down in the house of the Lord, that they might be conveyed to the potter; its being done in the temple indicates, that it was a solemn transaction, but the money being the price of blood, and also in the strictest sense unlawful gain, it could not be allowed to remain there—it must be sent to the potter. But why specially to the potter? Who was he? And do we hear of any such person actually existing at the time when this symbolical transaction became matter of history? We hear of none such, nor have we any reason to suppose, that any real personage in that line of business had the least connexion with the money given to Judas for his treachery. It is here, that the principle of interpretation, which we advocate, comes in, and on it alone can we educe a meaning from the words of the prophecy conformable to the truth of history. The prediction here rests on that of Jer. xix., and must be interpreted in connexion with it. By referring thither we learn, that the potter wrought in an unclean place, in the valley of the son of Hinnom, which had been the scene of the most horrid and abominable rites of idolatry, and marked as a place of infamy. Josiah polluted it with bones and dead flesh, 2 Kings xxiii. 10. Hence the Jews used to say of it, that *there* was the mouth of hell. And just as Jeremiah was there commanded to break the bottle in pieces, in token of the Lord's purpose to shatter and destroy the people because of their sins, so here the price of the good Shepherd was to be, as it were, cast there—

into the very place where their abominations in former times had cried so loud for vengeance, and where, by the action of Jeremiah, it had been foreshown, that as an abominable thing they were to be thrown down and dashed in fragments, as fit only for destruction, and that in the most detestable of places. The children were substantially to repeat over again the guilt of their fathers, and to make that guilt appear more palpable and offensive it is brought again into contact with the worst characters and relations of ancient times.*

Zechariah is by no means singular in the use of such language. We find the other prophets adopting the same method, and sometimes in a way which prevents almost the possibility of any mistake as to their meaning. Thus Hosea, ch. viii. 13, ix. 3, says, "Now will he remember their iniquity and visit their sins; they shall return to Egypt." Why to Egypt? Manifestly because that had been once the house of bondage, and is the type or representative of the future house; to make the idea of the future more striking and palpable, it is thrown into the terrific form of the past. Even Horsley, with all his predilection for another mode of interpretation, admits this to be the meaning of the prophet here, and calls "returning unto Egypt" a proverbial expression for conveying the idea above mentioned—although it is no more a proverbial expression than many others of a like nature, with which the word of prophecy abounds. We find a precisely similar use of the past in ch. ii. 14, where Israel is made to pass again through the wilderness, as on her way from Egypt, visited there with peculiar tokens of the Lord's kindness, and even the valley of Achor is specified as the scene of a trouble which should issue in hope. Is it for one moment to be supposed, that the journeyings in the desert are to be literally retraced by the natural Israel, and the same transactions, which occurred there centuries before, repeated over again? Assuredly not. Horsley, therefore, speaks in his comment of "her outcast state in the wilderness of the Gentile world," and treats those past events in Israel's history as only representing similar ones in her future history. But if the transactions were typical, why not also the people whom they concerned, and the land that people were going at the time to occupy? Surely if the prophecy speaks in one respect of a recurrence of past scenes, merely that it may more vividly portray and certainly indicate similar ones in the future, it must be a similar people also, in whose case they are to happen—that is, not the natural Israel, but the spiritual—those, who are now, what they were then, the true covenant-people. And there can be no more a future restoration to Canaan, than there shall be a future deliverance from Egypt, a future wilderness, or a future valley of Achor.—Precisely similar is the representation given in Mal. iii. 2, 3, of the effect of Christ's appearing under the image of refining and purifying the members of the old covenant, and in particular the sons of Levi—which even Horsley cannot avoid explaining thus: "The worship of God shall be purged of all hypocrisy and superstition, and reduced to a few simple rites, the natural expressions of true devotion. 'And then shall this offering of Judah and Jerusalem (i. e. of the true members of God's true church) be pleasant unto the Lord.'"

The many prophecies, which speak of David as the future king of the returning or restored people, belong also to this head. Those who insist on a fulfilment according to the very letter, should of course hold, that the

* It is from the intimate connexion subsisting between the two prophecies above noticed, and which renders the one in Zechariah a mere resumption and extended application of that in Jeremiah, that we are to explain the reference in Matth. xxvii. 9, where the prophecy about the thirty pieces of silver is ascribed to Jeremiah. It requires both prophecies to make out the full prediction, and Jeremiah alone is referred to as being the best known. (See Hengs. in loco.)

identical son of Jesse, who of old reigned over Israel, must do so again. There cannot be, if we are to have one species and a uniform principle of interpretation, a literal Israel, and an antitypical David. If the word Jew still stands simply for a Jew, the word David must in like manner do so for David. Or if, on the other hand, Christ comes in the room of David, Christ's people must surely come in the room of David's subjects. And it is a mongrel species of interpretation which would make only the one and not the other pass into the antitype, which insists on having the literal Israel only for the heritage of the spiritual David. Nay more, David must have his sons again succeeding him on the throne: for what says Jeremiah? "As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured; so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me," (Jer. xxxiii. 22.) To such absurdities are we reduced by the method of interpretation which looks to the naked words merely, and does not take into account the occasion and scope, the circumstances of time and action. Is it not clear as noon-day, that the prophet is here assuring the church of a perpetual King, a glorious Head to watch over, defend, and guide her affairs, and a never-failing supply of faithful and holy ministrations—and that, as the condition requisite for this under the old covenant was a constant succession in the houses of David and Levi, so he presents it under this form, as the one most easily and distinctly apprehensible by those who then lived? But if we must so understand what is there written of David and Levi, and the multiplication of their seeds respectively, with what consistence can we understand what is also written there of Judah and Jerusalem, of their restored prosperity and glory, otherwise than as a prediction of the good awaiting the whole church and kingdom of Christ—the city and people whereof he is King? No, say many, it must be the very city, the very throne, the very people of David—and till Christ come in the flesh, as the son of David, and Jerusalem be built again, and the national Israel restored to it, "the throne of David must want its king, and the kingdom of David its Lord."* But as David himself, as well as his seed, is said to reign, must he occupy it along with Christ? And as David's seed is to be multiplied like the stars, to secure an interminable succession, are both David and Christ to be subject to removal, that others may come in their room? For we say, in the language of the writer above referred to, "If we *must* take one part literally, let us be consistent, and take the whole in the same manner."† But what says Peter to such a kind of literalities? He says, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ;" and again, "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins," (Acts ii. 36, v. 31.) Does this look like David's throne wanting its king? If Christ *hath* been exalted to be a Prince, is he not seated upon a throne? And if seated on a throne, what throne is it? Is it David's, or some other? Was there any other ever promised him? And if not David's, why should Peter be so anxious for *all the house of Israel* knowing that Christ had risen to his dominion? Can we, in fairness and candour, give any other exposition of Peter's sentiments than this: Jesus of Nazareth is the long-predicted son of David; he has taken possession of his father's throne; and it concerns all the seed of Israel to place themselves beneath his sway? We can see no other honest interpretation of Peter's words, and we read in them a plain attestation to the principle, that such prophecies take their hue and shape, indeed, from Old Testament relations,

* Israel Restored, p. 154. † Ib. p. 149.

but that we must search farther and rise higher for the substance they contain.

We shall produce only another example of this, under the present series. It is the prophecy regarding the sending of Elijah in Malachi, which in the true spirit of ancient, as well as modern Jewish interpretation, we are told, must have its literal fulfilment in the resurrection and re-appearance of that prophet. The explanation of the angel, that John the Baptist was to be the messenger going before the Lord's face, that he should go in the spirit and power of Elijah, and that he should do precisely what the prophet foretold as the peculiar work of Elijah, viz. turn the hearts of the children to the fathers, &c.; all this goes for nothing with the writers in question. We even found one of them asserting that John did the very reverse of what the angel said he was to accomplish, and what the prophet predicted of Elijah. We have no hesitation, however, in taking the words of the angel in their native import, especially as we find that import confirmed, in the most express and unequivocal terms, by Christ himself, who, in answer to the question put to him by the disciples, "Why then say the scribes, that Elias must first come?" replied, "Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things; and how it is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at naught. But I say unto you, that Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him." There is an apparent contradiction here, which the disciples could not reconcile, and which our Lord was desirous of making plain to them. There were two difficulties in the matter. 1. The non-appearance, or rather the sudden disappearance of Elias, after he had for a moment appeared on the mount of transfiguration, which did not seem to accord with the current opinion, that Elias was personally to come and do a great work in Israel before Christ. The removal of this difficulty consisted in the assurance that John was the person meant by Elias, having come in his spirit, and to do substantially his work over again. 2. But then, admitting this, another difficulty presented itself, viz. that John did not appear to have done the work, for which, as the second Elias, he was sent,—a work of effectual, permanent reformation, such as would restore the degenerate children of that generation to the spiritual condition of their pious forefathers, and make parent and child substantially one, had not, in point of fact, except to a very limited extent, been accomplished. And how was this to be explained? On the principle, our Lord told them, of which we had formerly occasion to adduce several examples, viz. that in foretelling what this Elias was to do, the Lord had respect to his own bountiful gift and gracious intentions, not to the way in which sin might frustrate these. He refers to his own case, as precisely similar in this respect. Though foretold as the great restorer of Israel, who should redeem his people, and save them from the hands of all their enemies, he should suffer the most unworthy treatment, and the deepest sufferings at the hands of men, which would inevitably imply the exclusion of many from an interest in his work. In regard both to the Lord and his forerunner, it was true, that many "rejected the counsel of God against themselves," (Luke vii. 30.) Christ even says this was written of John,—not expressly written in Malachi's prediction of him, or any other, but implied in the very name by which he was designated, and the kind of work assigned him; for sent, as he was, to stir up such a thorough reformation and spiritual revival, as Elias was called to, he could not expect any thing but the like rough treatment. But still the counsel stood in regard to the elect few, whom God chiefly respected, and so far the promise was verified. Here, then, again, we have a prediction written out so exactly in the style of what was past in Israelitish his-

tory, that a carnal Jew or superficial inquirer was led to expect the personal appearance of Elias, while still the highest of all authority has assured us that quite another person was meant,—that the thing predicted was a New Testament idea, moulded after an Old Testament form;—and is it not simply to follow out the species of interpretation we are compelled and warranted to adopt in regard to this, and so many other cases, when in regard to precisely similar prophecies, written out in like manner, in the language of Old Testament events—the prophecies which speak of a restored Israel, a rebuilt Jerusalem, and a glorious temple, we cast off the form, and take the substance of the idea unfolded? When we think, in short, of a converted people, a redeemed and glorified church, and a renovated, blessed world for her possession and enjoyment? It is but to make the spirit of prophecy consistent with itself, and read the delineations of coming events by the light of past developments."*

Were we to take into account the prophecies contained in Revelation, those written there concerning Babylon might be cited as eminent examples of the great principle we have been endeavouring to establish. For it admits of no question, that these refer, not to the ancient city of Babylon, nor to any city at all, but to a system or spiritual kingdom, which in many important respects has the same relation to the church now, that Babylon had of old; the same enemy, scourge, and oppressor, which the one had been to the election of the seed of Abraham, the other was to be for a time, to the spiritual election under the gospel dispensation; and hence the history and doom of the latter are presented to the eye of the evangelist under the aspect of those of the former, with the addition of certain features derived from ancient Tyre, in order to fill up and complete the picture. No one supposes it to be necessary that the ancient site or dominion of Babylon has any thing to do with the fulfilment of these New Testament prophecies; and it only requires the like mode of interpretation to be applied to the Old Testament prophecies concerning the restoration of the Jews, and the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem, to arrive at the conclusion, that the real import of these is equally irrespective of the land and people of the literal Israel. Instead of enlarging further, however, upon any prophecies belonging to the class from which we have already cited so many examples, we shall rather direct attention very briefly to two special classes, which lend a peculiar confirmation to our principle of interpretation, as the pro-

* The declaration of John himself, in answer to the question, "Art thou Elias?" has often been produced as inconsistent with the view given of the matter above. He replied, No. But the explanation is obvious. He was not Elias in the sense *they* meant,—he was not the literal Elijah of the Old Testament. But when he goes on to say, that he was "the voice crying in the wilderness, spoken of by Esaias the prophet," he as much as says, that he was the Elias predicted by Malachi,—the special and immediate messenger going before the Lord: for these were evidently the same personages—one and the same herald of one and the same Lord.—The view above given is also confirmed by the expression of our Lord, when affirming John to be Elias, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear," (Matt. xi. 14,) which is always used in reference to something of recondite or solemn meaning, requiring a look beyond the surface into the deeper import and relation of things. "The words," says Lightfoot, "intimate a suspicion, that they would not receive this doctrine, which is also attested by the pertinacious adherence of that nation to this very day, to the belief, that Elias will personally come."—Nor does the expression in the prophet, of "the great and terrible day of the Lord," as that before which the Elias was to appear, present any difficulty. For the prophet speaks to the wicked, the proud despisers of God, and to such every manifestation of God must be a great and terrible day. But the sending of one Elias before his first manifestation to the Jews, may certainly be held to be a pledge, that not one merely, but many Eliases will be sent before his second manifestation to the church, as now scattered abroad. And what is every preacher of repentance to a corrupt and backsliding church, but an Elias? The church will need many such before Christ's advent in glory, for iniquity shall abound, and the love of many wax cold; and the Lord will assuredly raise them up.

vidence of God, the great interpreter of prophecy, has rendered their fulfilment, on any other principle, absolutely impossible.

1. One of these classes bears reference in its terms to the Jews themselves, and their future destiny;—such, for example, as Zech. xii., where the different families of David, Nathan, Levi, and Shimei, are mentioned as having a separate existence, and as families partaking of the same spiritual experiences; and if these, of course the natural and obvious inference is, that the other ancient families might in like manner have been particularized, as the whole land and all its families are described as sharing in the blessed revival. But it is matter of undoubted certainty, that all such distinctions have long ago ceased; the course of Divine Providence has swept them entirely away; not only the smaller branches and divisions of the Jewish family, but also the tribes themselves, have lost their separate existence; and from the very nature of the case, such distinctions, when once lost, can never be recalled,—the revival of them would imply, not the resuscitation of an old, but the creation of a new state of things. So long as any prophecies were depending for their fulfilment on the distinction of tribes and families, the distinction *was* preserved, and so too were the genealogical records to attest the fulfilment. These prophecies terminated in the son of Mary, the branch of the house of David, and lion of the tribe of Judah; and when he finished the work given him to do, as the vail, which separated the most holy place, was rent in twain, destroying the grand distinction at the centre, so every other distinction, to the utmost bounds of the system, was to be understood as falling along with it. Hence, we find the apostle discharging all from giving heed to endless genealogies, as no longer of any service in the church of God; and the providence of God shortly afterwards confirms the word, by scattering their genealogies to the winds, and fusing together in one undistinguishable, inextricable mass, the surviving remnants of the Jewish family. This prophecy, therefore, of Zechariah, (and the same substantially may be said of many similar ones,) being plainly rendered, by the providence of God, incapable of fulfilment in the literal sense, is a convincing proof of the soundness of our leading principle of interpretation; and when it speaks as if the old distinctions between Israel and Judah, of tribes and families and houses, were still in existence at the time to which it points, it is only to give life and colour to the delineation it presents of future things. It is a word both of mercy and of judgment. The judgment begins at the house of God, the nations of the earth coming up in hostile array against it, with the design of utterly subverting it; but God turns their counsel into foolishness; the stone they sought to roll for ever away, rushes back upon them with resistless fury; deliverance is obtained from the hand of the enemy; Jerusalem, the city of the living God, continues to sit secure in her place; and not only is the outward danger and distress made to pass away, but inward refreshment and life come in their room, and the church, through all her members and in all her families, presents a scene of extraordinary revival, as of life from the dead,—beginning, as such a work ever does, in deep abasement for sin, and yearnings of heart after Christ, and issuing in the complete abandonment of all that is idolatrous and unclean, (chap. xiii. 2—4.)

We cannot enter into any inquiry for the purpose of determining more exactly the import and bearing of the prophecy. But as another example of the same class, we would refer to Isaiah lx. 13, where, speaking of the magnificence of the New Jerusalem, the prophet says, "The glory of Lebanon shall be brought to thee." That there was a glory of Lebanon in Isaiah's time, in its spacious forests of lofty cedars, we sufficiently know; but where is that glory now? "The flower of Lebanon languisheth," and

"the fire hath devoured her cedars." It is from what Lebanon *was* to Jerusalem of old, not from any thing it is ever to be again, that we are to learn what the Spirit means in such a prediction; the best things of the past are employed to picture out the glories of the future; and in any other view the expression can hardly be said to have a meaning.

2. The other class of prophecies we referred to are such as make mention of other nations in respect to the future, sometimes alone, and at other times in connexion with Israel. Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Moab, &c., are constantly spoken of as having to do, whether for good or evil, in the promised restoration; and the three former, in particular, are named as the countries from which the restored are to come. No reason, except what is wholly fictitious and imaginary, can be rendered for this, but the fact, that these were the countries from which a restoration had already been, or was soon to be effected; the Jews have had no peculiar connexion with them since, for many centuries far less connexion than with various other regions, and such countries, as national powers, in which respect they are principally alluded to, are long since and irretrievably gone. The countries *from which*, the monarchies in *spite of which*, the restoration is to be effected, *must* be understood typically, as the most strenuous advocates of a literal restoration are constrained to allow;* and how, then, in candour and consistence, can we avoid regarding typically also the country *to which*, and the people *in whom?* How incongruous were it not to mix up in one prediction, and interchange with one another, the antitypical adversary and a literal Israel, an antitypical Egypt or Babylon, and a literal Judah or Jerusalem? It is impossible, that the tried words of God can be so arbitrary and capricious. And then, if we take all in one sense, and that the simply literal, the whole ancient world of the east will need to be reproduced and come back again into life and action, as it was before. There must again appear the Midianites, the Philistines, the Edomites, the ships of Tarshish, &c., (Isa. lx. 6, 9, xi. 14, lxiii., &c.) Tyre must also rise anew into existence, and with a better spirit, but with like success, ply her pursuits of merchandise, (Ps. xlv. 12, Isa. xxiii. 18.) Nay, the literal restoration of Israel to the holy land is to be no singular boon for them; the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Elamites, and others, not excepting even Sodom and the cities of the plain, are also to return from their captivity and resume their original position round Israel, (Jer. xlviii. 47, xlix., Ez. xvi.) Must we deny all history, and prostrate all reason to believe such things? Shall we not rather view the providence of God, in rendering them impossible, as clearly pointing the way to another mode of understanding this whole series of predictions, and putting its seal of confirmation upon the principle of interpretation we have been labouring to establish? Shall we not conclude, that the ancient objects, indeed, are past and gone, but that the ancient relations still substantially live, and that the future events foretold under the form and shadow of these shall be verified, not in the oldness of the letter, but in the newness of the spirit, on the far higher territory and more expansive field, which belongs to the church of the New Testament?

We can no otherwise give consistence to the revelations of God's mind and will, and obtain either a uniform or an enlarged view of his purposes. It has ever been the general character of his communications to his church, that they stand associated with manifold circumstances of place and time; and when prospective, as well as when immediate in their reference, they

* See for ex. Fry on Second Advent, Vol. I. 417, where on 63d ch. of Isaiah, Edom is "the country spiritually called Edom," i. e. "the European or Roman adversary," though the people are still the literal Jews. So in the same writer very frequently. So also M'Neile on the Jews, Lect. ii. p. 70, and elsewhere.

necessarily bear on them the type of past and present realities. And they do so, not arbitrarily, but from a reason grounded in the very nature of things. For all former good to the church, and evil to the adversaries of God, is a real pledge, a prophecy in action of similar good or evil hereafter in like circumstances to arise; because the church, through all ages, is essentially one in its character and interests; its history, from first to last, is the history of one great family of God; and its prospects of future good are made to take their starting-point and their form from what has actually been experienced in the days that are past, in order, not only to convey a more distinct and palpable idea of the future, but also to keep before the eye of the church the important fact of her essential oneness, to lead her members in one age to realize her interest in what befell, or was promised to befall those of another, and especially to lead her to regard the past good, under the form of which the future was presented to her hope, as a reason for the promises respecting the latter being conferred, and a pledge of their certain fulfilment. For the fact that God had already blessed his people with much good, was a proof that he would do so again whenever their spiritual condition was such as to allow of him doing so. Hence, the great mass of God's promises to his church take the form of a recovery, a restoration, or restitution, to a state of things previously existing, and varying from time to time in its particular aspect according to the pre-existing state immediately in the eye of the prophet. The state of things before the fall is the type, after which one great class of prophecies is modelled, (for ex. Ps. viii., Isa. xi. 6—9, lxv. 17—25, Rev. xxiii.;) the signal deliverance from Egypt first, and afterwards from Babylon, the type of another, (for ex. Isa. xi. 10—16, where both deliverances are intermingled in the representation, and that in immediate succession to the promised return of paradisiacal bliss, Jer. l., li., &c.;) the blessed rest, fulness of enjoyment, and manifold goodness, which was inherited in Canaan, especially in the times of David and Solomon, the type of another and far larger class, given for the most part when every thing wore an entirely different aspect, and pointing sometimes more immediately to one, sometimes to another feature of the departed good—such as the recovery of the land, or the new erection and revived glory of the temple, or the re-exaltation of the house of David, or the uninterrupted flow of peace and prosperity. And to regard all such prophecies, as we conceive they should be, in the light of typical delineations, drawn out in the form and pattern of former things, and to be interpreted by an eye to these as containing "not the very image, but a shadow only" of the other and better things to come, is just to suppose that God dealt by the facts of his special providence, as he did by the institutions of his symbolical worship—that both had, as we trust we formerly proved, substantially one character and design, and were capable of being alike employed in furnishing the ideas and the language for depicting the future prospects of the church. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in pressing on their acceptance the good things which had then come, takes his standing-point on the floor of the earthly tabernacle, so the prophets, in describing the prospect of the good things that were still to come, take their standing-point on the floor of earthly dispensations, descrying in these the pattern of what was hereafter to be. And we should be as far from apprehending the real import of their representations by imagining the recurrence of the events to which they refer, as we should be in regard to the Epistle of the Hebrews by supposing the necessity in the New Testament church of a visible outer and inner sanctuary, real sprinklings with blood, or an actual door-way into the presence of God.

We conclude our dissertation by briefly noticing some of the leading arguments which are advanced on the other side.

1. That part of the predictions, respecting the Jews, which foretold what evils were to befall them, has been fulfilled to the letter; and it is unreasonable to suppose, and betrays something like an ungenerous spirit toward them, even to conceive, that the other and brighter side of the picture shall not be realized too. This is, no doubt, a plausible objection, but it is superficial; for it proceeds on an ignorance or disregard of the true ground of the prophetical delineations, viz. the typical character of the old relations. Admit this, and then of necessity there must be a literality so long as these stood, but no longer; whenever the antitype has come, the literality in that respect ceases. All interpreters are obliged to see this, whether they will or not, in regard to Egypt, Babylon, Moab, Tyre, Edom, &c.; and if they would go without prejudice or bias to the interpretation of Scripture, and with well-defined, well-grounded principles, we are persuaded they would soon see it in regard to the Jews also. But these Jews, it is said, as a people, inherit to this day a curse; and if they do, so long after the gospel antitypes have come, why may they not become subjects of blessing, as a people, when they return to the Lord, and get in their separate capacity the fulfilment of the promises? Just because their return carries in its very bosom the destruction of their separate being. So long as they maintain their separation, they are apostates and outcasts, and cannot but inherit, in the most literal sense, the curse, as all must do, who are in that condition. But though Levi and other Jewish, as well as many Christian writers, complain of it as a harsh supposition, that while the curse is thus literal and national, the promise is no farther to be fulfilled in them, than by their entering, on conversion, into the present blessings and future hopes of the Christian church, as if no proper good could be enjoyed by them, unless it were earthly in its nature, and held by themselves alone,—this is merely to play upon appearances, and misapprehend the real nature of things. No man surely, who is looking for a solitary piece of bread, has reason to complain if he is treated in company with others to a sumptuous feast. The prophecies, viewed in the light we have endeavoured to represent them, unfold to the whole church of God far greater and better things, than the carnal Jew is anticipating; and if, coming to a better mind, he is treated to the possession of these, and at last rises to the inheritance of the saints in light, he will have reason to thank God for having done more and better for him, than he had conceived, and will find his portion of good enhanced, rather than diminished, by his having so many to share with him in its enjoyment.*

* The argument noticed above for the restoration of the Jews, is the one chiefly pressed by the author himself, in the Lecture he delivered some years ago on the subject in Glasgow, one in the volume of Lectures on the Jews by ministers of the Church of Scotland. He had not then leisure to consider the subject in its proper bearings, especially in its connexion with the whole typical relations of the Old Testament people and things; it was viewed simply by itself; and when so viewed, a very partial and defective idea must necessarily be formed of the subject. The argument, however, is often carried further by those who contend for the literal restoration, than is stated above, and it is affirmed, that not only the threatenings affecting the Jews, but all the prophecies which respect the humiliation of Christ, have been fulfilled to the very letter, and hence also those which respect his royal glory. This has been asserted with endless frequency, and yet a moment's reflection is sufficient to expose its fallacy. Did Christ, in the very letter, bruise the head of the serpent? Or, was he called Immanuel? Or, did he eat butter and honey, till he came to the years of discretion? Or, was he anointed or oiled to preach and to rule? Or, was he taken from prison? Or, did he open a fountain for sin and uncleanness? Or, were his ears bored? Such questions might be vastly multiplied; but these alone may show how rashly men can write on the most solemn subjects, and how inconsiderately they can bring into peril the truth of God's word. I believe, with Vitringa, that "every thing in the prophecies, rightly explained and understood, down to the minutest particulars, will be (or has been) fulfilled," (on Isa. lx.) But neither reason nor Scripture, nor the providence of God, tend to persuade me, that such fulfilment must be according, as it is called, *to the very letter.*

2. It is further argued in support of a literal restoration of the Jews, that many of the prophecies bearing on the subject are very precise in their terms, and go much into detail—specifying, for example, the houses both of Israel and Judah, as alike interested in the coming good, and mentioning definite places and boundaries as again to be occupied. There can be no doubt that there are such specifications; but these by no means infer the unsoundness of our mode of interpretation, and the correctness of the other. A certain degree of speciality and detail was absolutely needful for the one view, as well as the other; and we may have the less hesitation in regarding the particulars actually given as typical delineations and individualizings of the general truths intended to be conveyed, since, if viewed otherwise, they will sometimes cross one another, or express manifest impossibilities. Thus, according to Malachi i. 11, every place is to be consecrated to God for the offering of incense and oblation; while, according to Isa. lxvi. 23, and Zech. xiv. 16, all are to repair to the one temple at Jerusalem, to worship and keep the appointed feasts. And how often repair? Zechariah says only to keep the feast of tabernacles, (implying, by the very limitation, that not the carnal rite itself, but the idea symbolized by it, was in the mind of the prophet,) but Isaiah says from sabbath to sabbath. That this, in the naked and literal sense, exceeds all bounds of probability, and was consequently designed to teach, that it should not be so understood, even Mr. Fry substantially admits, when he speaks of being doubtful "how far it is to be literally accomplished, or in what manner it is symbolical of something new in the kingdom of God;" although, we have no doubt, that the grand idea it embodies is, to use a portion of his own words, that "a real theocracy shall be established over all the nations, and shall extend its dominion to the utmost limits of the globe."* But if the language here *must* be symbolical, why should we doubt its possessing this character elsewhere, when similar delineations are employed? In like manner, the accounts given in Zech. xiv., and Isa. lxvi., of the destruction of the Lord's enemies in the last great conflict, are considerably different,—perfectly consistent if viewed as symbolical representations of a grand idea, the sudden, complete, and terrible nature of the destruction, but contradictory if viewed as literally descriptive of an outward occurrence; for in the one case it is said to proceed by fire and sword, in the other by a plague. Again, what various, and in a literal sense, opposing representations are given of the state of things succeeding the restoration? Sometimes the land is spoken of as too narrow for its proper occupants, (Isa. xlix. 20,) and again, as able to accommodate strangers besides, (Ez. xlvii. 22;) sometimes as all converted into a level plain around Jerusalem and elevated, (Zech. xiv. 10,) and again as retaining its mountainous form, with the exception of the site of the temple, (Isa. ii.;) now it is David, who is to rule in the land, again a branch of David, and again a prince with sons, &c.:—all admitting of an easy explanation, if considered as typical or symbolical representations, but otherwise, at irreconcilable variance with each other. We do not need to except the most minute and specific descriptions, such as those given in Jer. xxxi. 30—40, Zech. xiv. 10, or the concluding chapters of Ezekiel, of the city to be rebuilt, which are all pregnant with great and important truths concerning the kingdom of God, though it would take us too long to investigate them here. For the first two, however, see Hengstenberg's Christology.

3. But certain declarations of Christ are alleged to prove the fact of a literal restoration and its several results. Luke xxi. 24, "Jerusalem shall

* Second Advent, Vol. I. p. 443.

be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled;" i. e. we are told, only till then—then she again revives—the identical Jerusalem again from a heap of ruins becomes a splendid city. Unwarranted and groundless inference, springing from a desire, too often manifested, to make Christ's testimony more express and positive than it really was. His words here simply declare, that as the kingdom was now to be taken from the Jews, and an earthly centre, like Jerusalem, was no longer needed, and as such a city would, if it existed, be but a delusion and a mockery, the providence of God would so order events, that it should never rise from its state of depression and misery during the whole continuance of this gospel-age. But the declaration goes no farther—it leaves all beyond a blank page, and to make it express more, is to fill it up with words of our own.—Acts i. 6, "Lord, (said the disciples to Jesus,) wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father has put in his own power;" which means, it is confidently affirmed, that the kingdom is some time to be restored to Israel in the sense in which the disciples used the expression, only that they were to be kept ignorant of the time when that was to take place. Again, an inference without a just foundation. The disciples ask an improper question, prying with unsanctified curiosity into the hidden future, and the Lord returns an evasive answer, which was intended simply to rebuke such curiosity and to turn their thoughts into a more salutary direction. Just as, when Peter, (John xxi.) with unbecoming forwardness, asked what John was to do, and was repelled by the answer, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" from which, it would seem, the early disciples drew as hasty and groundless an inference as many in the present day do from the other.

4. The views and expectations of the Jews themselves are not unfrequently appealed to as a proof, that the Hebrew prophets predict a real restoration; for that the Jews confidently expect such a restoration, admits of no doubt. But to go to them for light on such a question, is truly to go in the wrong direction; it is like asking the way from men whose eyes are sealed in darkness. If Christ could charge the most enlightened of them in his day with ignorance of the simplest truths, and the most grievous misapprehensions of the meaning of Scripture, much more might they be so charged now, when given up to judicial blindness and wedded to almost every form of error. That *they* should so uniformly look for a literal restoration and an earthly Jerusalem, should rather be taken as evidence to the contrary; more especially, as it is well known their expectations assume precisely the same carnal form that they did in the days of our Lord's flesh, and are mixed up with the most puerile absurdities. "They do not look," says Hyam Isaacs, "for a spiritual reign, but a temporal one, and Jerusalem they look upon as their paradise. And all the Jews, who have died and been buried since the creation of the world, will work their passage under ground the same as moles, and rise on the very spot where the temple stood in the days of old."* Then are to follow the royal banquet, the entertainment with flesh, fish, and fowl, at the golden table, exquisite wines, music and dancing, the carnal marriage of Messiah, &c.† It is by a literal, or, as it should rather be termed, a carnal application of Scripture, that they have come to entertain such unworthy views. And the fact of their doing so, should not only be sufficient to prevent any appeal to them

* Forms, &c., of the Jews, p. 259.
† See Allen's Modern Judaism, pp. 278—288.

as authorities, but also to demonstrate the folly of such a mode of handling the word of God.

5. Lastly, the extraordinary preservation and unchanging nationality of the Jews is often pointed to as a clear sign from Heaven, that they are reserved for important purposes in their separate position, and that in their converted, as well as in their unconverted state, they are not to be mingled with the nations, but to dwell alone. Certainly there are many great purposes to be wrought out by the events of their history in both its stages. In their present peeled and scattered condition they are witnesses to the truth of God's threatenings, his righteous indignation against apostacy and unbelief, and the utter impossibility of men hardening their heart against him and yet prospering in their course. When they are brought back, as we know they shall be, by extraordinary manifestations of divine power and mercy, from all their wanderings, and look in faith to him whom they have pierced, they shall be witnesses, such as the world has never seen, on an extensive scale at least, to the everlasting truth of God's promises, the amazing depth of his goodness and mercy, and the omnipotence of his grace; so that their reception into the church shall be like life from the dead. But it is the church that is to receive them, not they who are, as it were, to receive the church; and beyond these results connected with their reception, we are not warranted by New Testament scripture to go concerning them. The apostle is silent in the Epistle to the Romans as to any thing farther. In Revelation also there is an ominous silence; not a word is dropt respecting them as a separate people, having a distinct and isolated standing in the Christian church, either before or after the final restitution of all things—most strange and unaccountable, if such a standing is really to belong to them, and is to possess the breadth and magnitude so often assigned to it. There is a sealed company of Jews there, but these beyond a question are a portion of the election of grace, connected with the present dispensation; also a Jerusalem, a temple, and an altar, but all belonging to the Christian church as a whole.* And that the distinction was intended to cease always, and whenever the faith of the gospel was embraced, seems the plain and incontestable meaning of the declarations, that "in Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile," that "the middle wall of partition is broken down," &c.; nor was less indicated by the significant fact, at the threshold of the Christian dispensation, that the chief apostle of the circumcision first opened the door of faith to the Gentiles, while the apostle to the Gentiles every where made known the message of salvation in the first instance to the Jews—as if purposely to show how completely the two divisions of the human family were now to be amalgamated in Christ. And for what, indeed, was the separation at first made? Why were Abraham and his seed called out from the other nations of the earth? Not to stand in a direct and proper antagonism to these nations, as if the real interests of the one could only be promoted at the expense of those of the other. On the contrary, the separation was avowedly made from the very first for the accomplishment of the ultimate good of the nations, being designed to secure for them a blessing, and for enabling them also to rejoice with the seed of Abraham, as partakers of one salvation and joint-heirs of one inheritance, (Gen. xii. 3, Deut. xxxii. 43.) So that when the calling of the Gentiles effectually began, the distinct and peculiar calling of the seed of Abraham necessarily ceased; and for them to abide still in the separation is their sin, their misery, and their punishment, which God overrules indeed for good to the church, but which he

* See Elliot's Horæ Apoc., Vol. I. p. 130.

would rather see finally and for ever abolished by their coming again in faith to be ingrafted into the one good olive tree.

It was one of the capital errors, into which the Jewish people fell, even when they were in covenant with God, and which led to one of their most grievous and dangerous delusions, that their separate position was not simply a means to a further end, but a good of itself, so fixed, that it rendered them, as a whole, the objects of blessing, and so important, that God's purposes could not proceed without it. They hence, as before remarked, too often looked upon their mere descent from Abraham as sufficient to secure their well-being. And it was one great object of God's revelations by the prophets, especially in times of corruption, to point out their entire misapprehension of his meaning in this respect—to convince them, that his purpose of election was for a holy end in regard to themselves, for a good and gracious end in regard to others—that he ever had in view, not simply the seed of Abraham, but that seed in so far as it possessed the faith and character of Abraham—that if individuals from among the Gentiles possessed this spirit, they might (as in the case of Ruth and others) attain to the most peculiar blessings of the covenant, while, if they themselves lost it, they became in God's sight as the heathen, and worse even than they.* And if this were the case, even when the distinction stood in all its rigour—if the circumcision in the flesh were chosen and endowed with peculiar privilege, only that God might thereby obtain a circumcision in heart, it were against all reason to suppose, that when the circumcised in flesh shall become again circumcised in heart, they shall stand apart from others, to whom this characteristic already belongs. This were to make God a respecter of persons—a builder up of mere outside distinctions, as something good in themselves—which he has ever repudiated. It is just conceivable, that if the Jews are converted as a people some time before the final restitution of all things, and after a period of backsliding on the part of the Gentile churches, a supposition which has much to favour it in the word of prophecy; they may for a season, though it can only be for that, be so much more circumcised in heart than others, so much more deeply imbued with the spirit of Abraham, and qualified for the service of God in the latter days, that they shall rise on that account to a higher standing than the rest of the church, and again occupy a kind of centre-place in the kingdom of God. If so, however, it will be less because they are of the seed of Abraham, than because they are of his heart and his faith. It were no doubt conceivable, also, that if thus raised for a period to the highest position in the church, they might at the same time be restored to a temporary occupancy of the land of their fathers, (as Dr. Candlish seems to think probable, p. 318;) but we can see no ground for this, which would not equally go to prove the re-establishment of the entire Jewish polity, and that for the whole earth,—no ground, in fact, but what virtually destroys the typical relations of the Old Testament church, and renders it impossible to give a uniform and consistent interpretation to the word of prophecy. The more the subject is considered, the more we are persuaded it will be found, that there is no middle point to stand upon, between the views set forth in the preceding pages, and those which require the literal and exact reproduction of the Old Testament state of things.

* Isa. i. 10, Jer. iv. 6, ix. 25, 26, Ez. xvi., &c.

END OF VOLUME I.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE EXPLAINED.

Gen. xviii. 156–157
Ex. xii. 46, ... 103
1 Sam. ii. 1—10, ... 106
2 Sam. vii. 13—16, . 116–118
Ps. ii. 112–114
viii. 285–320
xi. 6, ... 308
xvi. 10, 11, ... 126
xxiv. 6, ... 301
xliv. 22, ... 101
xlv. 118
lxviii. 2, ... 102
lxix. 9, ... 101
lxxii. 118
Isa. i. 26—28, ... 305
vii. 14, &c., ... 129
xi. 6—9, . . . 285–320
xi. 14, ... 319
xxiii. 18, ... 319
xxxiv. 9, 10, ... 308
xl. 3—8, ... 118
xlix. 8, ... 101
lx. 307
lx. 13, ... 308
lxi. 3, ... 308
lxiii. 1, ... 319
lxv. 17—25, ... 320
lxvi. 23, ... 322
Jer. xxiii. 6, ... 302
xxiv. 5—7, ... 300
xxix. 10—14, . . 298, 302
xxxii. 303
xxxiii. 7, ... 302
xxxiii. 22, ... 315
xlii. 10, ... 300
xlviii. 47, ... 319
xlix. 319
Dan. viii. 14, ... 312
ix. 24, ... 312
Hos. ii. 14, ... 314
viii. 13, ... 314
ix. 3, ... 314
xi. 1, ... 96, 102
Hag. ii. 6—9, . . . 305, 308–309
Zech. i. 16, ... 303
ii. 4, 5, &c., ... 303
iii. 6—10, ... 312
v. 5—11, ... 313
vi. 9—15, ... 311
viii. . 304–305, 308, 310
xi. 13, ... 313
xii. 162–163
Zech. xii. 10, ... 99
xii. 12—14, ... 318
xiii. 7, ... 99
xiv. 20, 21, ... 305
xiv. 16, ... 322
Mal. ii. 4—9, ... 301
iii. 2, 3, ... 314
iii. 17, ... 301, n.
iv. 5, ... 316
Matth. ii. 15, ... 96, 101
ii. 23, ... 98
v. 5, ... 286
viii. 17, ... 97, n.
xi. 11, ... 41
xiii. 35, ... 102, n.
xxvi. 31, ... 99, n.
xxvii. 9, ... 314
Luke ii. 46—55, ... 107
xxi. 24, ... 322
John ii. 17, ... 101
xviii. 9, ... 99, n.
xix. 36, ... 103
xix. 37, ... 99, n.
Acts i. 6, ... 323
ii. 36, ... 315
iii. 21, ... 285
v. 31, ... 315
Rom. viii. 19, ... 285
viii. 36, ... 101
xv. 3, ... 101
1 Cor. x. 1—6, ... 53
xv. 27, 28, ... 285
2 Cor. vi. 2, ... 101
Gal. iii. 25, ... 48
iv. 3, ... 48
iv. 24, ... 15
Eph. i. 14, ... 278
Col. ii. 16, 20, ... 46, 48
Heb. ii. 5—9, ... 285
iii. 53
iv. 53
v. 11—14, ... 31
viii. 5, ... 46
1 Pet. i. 2, ... 154–156
iii. 20, ... 228
iii. 21, ... 233
2 Pet. iii. 13, ... 286
Rev. ii. 7, ... 184
v. 9, ... 287
xx. 1—9, ... 287
xxii. 14, ... 184

THE

TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE,

OR

THE DOCTRINE OF TYPES

Investigated in its Principles,

AND

APPLIED TO THE EXPLANATION OF THE EARLIER REVELATIONS OF GOD, CONSIDERED AS PREPARATORY EXHIBITIONS OF THE LEADING TRUTHS OF THE GOSPEL.

BY

REV. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN,

SALTON.

TWO VOLUMES IN ONE.

VOL. II.

MOSAIC PERIOD.

PHILADELPHIA:

DANIELS & SMITH, NO. 36 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

1852.

WM. S. YOUNG, PRINTER.

PREFACE.

The work here presented to the public forms the completion of the plan formerly sketched by the author, and in part also executed, on the Typology of Scripture. Though the present may be regarded as in a great measure a separate and independent production, yet, in any estimate that may be formed of its bearing on the general interpretation of the Word of God, the author trusts it will be viewed in connexion with the principles laid down and illustrated in the previous volume. It may possibly be thought by some, that in a work professedly treating only of what is typical in ancient scripture, a space unduly large is occupied with discussions connected with the Moral Law, to which the typical element does not immediately belong. But if the subject is viewed in a comprehensive light, and treated in its just proportions, the relation between what is commonly called the moral and the ceremonial in Judaism, will be found to be such as to render it impossible to attain to a clear understanding and correct estimate of the one, without having previously understood and estimated aright the character and position of the other. Besides, the slight and unsatisfactory, often, indeed, palpably defective and erroneous views which are put forth regarding the law, in works connected with the Old Testament dispensation, appeared to the author to justify a more careful and extended consideration of this part of the subject than might otherwise have been necessary. He regrets having been obliged to throw

so much matter, especially in the latter Part, into the form of notes; but it was impossible to avoid this, as otherwise much that was deemed important in the defence of truth, or the exposure of error, must either have been entirely omitted, or the text itself have assumed too much of a controversial appearance. That there may be no intermingling of error in the author's own views, he is too conscious of human infirmity to pretend, but he can confidently say, that his most earnest desire and constant aim has been, to ascertain and vindicate the truth; and in this confidence he commits the fruit of his labours to Him from whom whatever it contains of truth has come, and to whom alone the glory is due.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE RELIGIOUS TRUTHS AND PRINCIPLES EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE REDEMPTION FROM EGYPT, VIEWED WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THEIR TYPICAL BEARING IN REGARD TO THE HIGHER THINGS OF CHRIST'S REDEMPTION, . . 9—70

CHAPTER I.

The Bondage, ... 9—25

CHAPTER II.

The Deliverer and his Commission, ... 25—33

CHAPTER III.

The Deliverance, ... 33—49

CHAPTER IV.

The March through the Wilderness, 49–66—Manna, 52–58—Water from the Rock, 58–64—The Pillar of Cloud and Fire, 64–66—The long Sojourn in the Wilderness, ... 66—70

PART II.

THE DIRECT INSTRUCTION GIVEN TO THE ISRAELITES BEFORE THE ERECTION OF THE TABERNACLE, AND THE INSTITUTION OF ITS SYMBOLICAL SERVICES, 71—150

CHAPTER I.

What properly, and in the strictest sense, termed the Law, viz., the Decalogue—Its perfection and completeness, both as to the order and substance of its Precepts, ... 71—87

CHAPTER II.

The Law continued—Apparent exceptions to its perfection and completeness as the permanent and universal standard of religious and moral obligations—The references it embodies to the circumstances of the Israelites, and the threatening, in particular, of a visitation of evil upon the children for the sins of the parents, . . 87—93

CHAPTER III.

The Law continued—Further exceptions, the appointment of the Sabbath, ... 94—113

CHAPTER IV.

What the Law could not do—The covenant-standing and privileges of Israel before it was given, ... 114—124

CHAPTER V.

The purposes for which the Law was given, and the connexion between it and the symbolical Institutions, ... 124—135

CHAPTER VI.

The relation of believers under the New Testament to the Law—In what sense they are free from it—And why it is no longer proper to keep the symbolical institutions connected with it, . . . 136—150

PART III.

THE RELIGIOUS TRUTHS AND PRINCIPLES EMBODIED IN THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS AND SERVICES OF THE MOSAIC DISPENSATION, CONSIDERED IN THEIR TYPICAL REFERENCE TO THE BETTER THINGS TO COME, . 151—324

CHAPTER I.

Introductory—On the question why Moses was instructed in the wisdom of the Egyptians, and what influence this might be expected to exercise on his future legislation, ... 151—169

CHAPTER II.

The Tabernacle in its general structure and design, . . 169—186

CHAPTER III.

The ministers of the Tabernacle—The Priests and Levites, . 186—209

CHAPTER IV.

The division of the Tabernacle into two apartments, 210–211—The Forecourt, with its Laver and Altar of Sacrifice, 211–216—The fundamental idea of sacrifice by blood, and the import of the three main points connected with its presentation, ... 216—226

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV.—Containing an Examination of Baehr's views on Sacrifice, ... 226—233

CHAPTER V.

The Most Holy Place, with its furniture, and the services connected with it on the Day of Atonement, ... 234—248

CHAPTER VI.

The Holy Place, with its furniture, and services, 249—The Altar of Incense, 249–252—The Table of Show-bread, 252–256—The Golden Candlestick, ... 256—259

CHAPTER VII.

The offerings and services connected with the brazen altar in the court of the Tabernacle, 260—Sin-offerings, 262–269—The Trespass-offering, 269–273—The Burnt-offering, 273–276—The Peace-offering, 276–280—The Meat-offering, ... 280—282

CHAPTER VIII.

Special Rites and Institutions, chiefly connected with Sacrifice, 282—The Ratification of the Covenant, 283–285—The Red Heifer, 286–289—The Leprosy, and its purification, 289–293—The Nazarite and his offerings, 293–297—Distinctions of Clean and Unclean in Food, . . 297—301

CHAPTER IX.

The stated Solemnities and Feasts, 301—The weekly Sabbath, 301–305—The Feast of the Passover, 305–309—Of Pentecost, 309–311—Of Trumpets (New Moons,) 311–313—The Day of Atonement, 313—The Feast of Tabernacles, 313–318—The Sabbatical Year and Year of Jubilee, 318—319

CONCLUSION.

On typical developments in the subsequent history of Israel—Especially the conquest and possession of Canaan, and the institution of the kingly government, ... 320

THE

TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE.

MOSAIC DISPENSATION.

PART I.

THE RELIGIOUS TRUTHS AND PRINCIPLES EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE REDEMPTION FROM EGYPT, VIEWED WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THEIR TYPICAL BEARING IN RESPECT TO THE HIGHER THINGS OF CHRIST'S REDEMPTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE BONDAGE.

THE history of what is called the Patriarchal religion may be said to terminate with the descent of the children of Israel into Egypt, or, at least, with the prosperous circumstances which attended the earlier period of their sojourn there. For the things which afterwards befell them in that land rather belong to the dispensation of Moses. They tended, in various respects, to prepare the way for this new dispensation, and especially by furnishing the facts, in which its fundamental ideas were to be embodied, and on which its institutions were to be based. The true religion has, in all its stages, distinguished itself from impostures, by being founded on great facts, which by bringing prominently out the character of God's purposes and government, provide the essential elements of the religion he prescribes to his people. This characteristic of the true religion, like every other, received its highest manifestation in the gospel of Christ, where almost every doctrine, precept and promise, is made to grow out of the facts of his wonderful history,—those more especially of his death and resurrection. The same characteristic, however, belongs, though in a less perfect form, to the patriarchal religion, which was based upon the transactions connected with man's fall, his expulsion from the garden of Eden, and the promise then given of a future

deliverer:—these formed, in a manner, the ground-floor of the symbolical and typical religion, under which the earlier inhabitants of the world were placed. Nor was it otherwise with the religious dispensation which stood midway between the Patriarchal and the Christian—the dispensation of Moses. For here also the groundwork was laid in the facts of Israel's history, which were so arranged by the controlling hand of God, as clearly to disclose the leading truths and principles that were to pervade the entire dispensation, and that gave to its religious institutions their peculiar form and character.

When we speak of fundamental truths and principles, in reference to the Mosaic religion, it will be readily understood, that these would require to be somewhat more full and comprehensive than those which constitute the foundation of the first and simplest form of religion. The Mosaic religion did not start into being as something original and independent; it grew out of the Patriarchal, and was just, indeed, the Patriarchal religion in a farther state of progress and development. So much was this the case, that the mission of Moses avowedly begins where the communications of God to the patriarchs end, and, resuming what had been for a time suspended, takes for its immediate object the fulfilment of the purpose, which the Lord before had pledged his word to accomplish.* Its real starting-point is the covenant made with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with an especial reference to that part of it which concerned the occupation of the land of Canaan. And as the one dispensation thus commenced with the express design of carrying out and completing what the other had left unfinished, the latter of the two must be understood to have recognised and adopted as its own all the truths and principles of the first. What might *now* be regarded as fundamental, and required as such to be interwoven with the historical transactions by which the dispensation of Moses was brought in, must have been, to a considerable extent, super-additional,—including those, indeed, which belonged to the Patriarchal religion, but coupling with them such others as were fitted to constitute the elements of a more advanced state of religious knowledge and attainment.

We are not to imagine, however, that the additional religious truths and principles, which were to be historically brought out at the commencement of the Mosaic dispensation, must have appeared there by themselves, distinct and apart from those which descended from Patriarchal times. We would rather expect, from the common ground on which the true religion always erects itself, and the common end it aims at, that the new would be intermingled with the old; and that the ideas, on which the first religion was based, must re-appear and stand prominently forth in the next, and indeed in every religious dispensation. The Patriarchal religion began with the loss of man's original inheritance, and pointed in all its institutions of worship and providential dealings, to the recovery of what was lost; it was the merciful provision of Heaven

* Ex. iii. 7—17.

to light the way, and direct the steps of Adam's fallen family to a paradise restored. The religion brought in by the ministry of Moses began with an inheritance, not lost, indeed, but standing at an apparently hopeless distance, though conferred in free grant, and secured by covenant-promise for a settled possession. As an expression of the good-will of God to men, and the object of hope to his church, the place originally held by the garden of Eden, with the way barred to the tree of life, but ready to be opened, whenever the righteousness should be brought in, for which the church was taught to wait in longing expectation, was now substantially occupied by that land flowing with milk and honey, which had become the destined inheritance of the heirs of promise. It was the immediate design and object of the mission of Moses to conduct the church, as called to cherish this new form of hope, into the actual possession of its promised blessings; and to do this, not simply with the view of having the hope turned into reality, but so as, at the same time, and in accordance with God's general plan, to unfold the great principles of his character and government, and raise his church to a higher position in all religious knowledge and experience. In a word, God's object, then, was as it has ever been, not merely to bring his church to the possession of a promised good, but to furnish, by his method of doing it, the elements of a religion, corresponding in its nature and effects to the inheritance possessed or hoped for, and thus to render the whole subservient to the highest purposes of his moral government.

When we speak, however, of the inheritance of Canaan being in the time of Moses the great object of hope to the church, and the boon which his mission was especially designed to realize, we must take into account what, we trust, was satisfactorily established concerning it, in the earlier part of our investigations.* 1. The earthly Canaan was never designed by God, nor could it, from the first, have been understood by his people, to be the ultimate and proper inheritance which they were to occupy—things having been spoken and hoped for concerning it, which plainly could not be realized within the bounds of Canaan, nor on the earth at all, as at present constituted. 2. The inheritance, in its full and proper sense, was one which could be enjoyed only by those who had become children of the resurrection, themselves fully redeemed in soul and body from the effects and consequences of sin. 3. The occupation of the earthly Canaan by the natural seed of Abraham, in its grand and ultimate design, was a type of the occupation by a redeemed church of her destined inheritance of glory. Hence, every thing concerning the entrance of Israel on that temporary possession had necessarily to be ordered, so as fitly to represent and foreshadow the things which belong to the church's establishment in her final and permanent possession. The matter may thus be briefly stated: God selected a portion—probably at that time the fairest portion of the earth,† which he

* Typology of Scripture, p. 264—289.

† Ez. xx. 6.—"A land that I had espied for them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands."

challenged as his own in a peculiar sense, that he might convert it into a suitable habitation and inheritance for the people whom he had already chosen to be peculiarly his own. On this people, settled in this possession, he purposed to bestow the highest earthly tokens of his gracious presence and blessing. But what he was going to do for them in temporal and earthly things, was only a representation and a pledge of what, from before the birth of time, he had purposed to do in heavenly things, when the period should come for gathering into one his universal church, and planting her in his everlasting inheritance of life and glory. There is, therefore, a twofold object to be kept in view, while we investigate this part of the divine procedure and arrangements, just as in these also there was a twofold design. The whole that took place between the giving of the hope to the patriarchs, and its realization in their posterity, we must, in the first instance, view as demonstrating, on what principles God could, consistently with his character and government, bestow upon them such an inheritance, or keep them in possession of its blessings. But we must, at the same time, in another point of view, regard the whole as the shadow of higher and better things to come. We must take it as a glass, in which to see mirrored the form and pattern of God's everlasting kingdom, and that with an especial reference to the grand principles on which the heirs of salvation were to be brought to the enjoyment of its future and imperishable glories.

We are furnished at the very outset, with no doubtful indication of the propriety of keeping in view this twofold bearing, in the condition of the heirs of promise. These, when the promise was first given, and for two generations afterwards, were kept in the region of the inheritance; and if the purposes of God respecting them had simply been directed to their occupation of it as a temporal and earthly good, the natural, and in every respect the easiest plan, would manifestly have been, to give them a settled place in it at the first, and gradually to have opened the way to their complete possession of the promised territory. But instead of this, they were absolutely prohibited from having then any fixed habitation within its borders; and by God's special direction and overruling providence, were carried altogether away from the land and planted in Egypt. There they found a settled home and dwelling place, which they were not only permitted, but obliged to keep for generations, before they were allowed to possess any interest in the promised inheritance. And it was precisely their long-continued sojourn in that foreign country, the relations into which it brought them, the feelings and associations which there grew upon them, and the interests with which they became connected, that so greatly embarrassed the mission of Moses, and rendered the work given him to do so peculiarly difficult and complicated. Had nothing more been contemplated by their settlement in Canaan than their simply being brought to the possession of a pleasant and desirable inheritance, after the manner of this world, nothing could have been more unfortunate and adverse than

such a deep and protracted entanglement with the affairs of Egypt. Considered merely in that point of view, there is much in the divine procedure, which could neither be vindicated as wise, nor approved as good; and the whole plan would manifestly lie open to the most serious objections. But matters present themselves in a different light, when we understand that every thing connected with the earthly and temporal inheritance was ordered so as to develope the principles, on which alone God could righteously confer upon men even that inferior token of his regard,—and this again, as the type or pattern, according to which he should afterwards proceed in regulating the concerns of his everlasting kingdom:—Viewed thus, as the whole ought to be, it will be found in every part consistent with the highest reason, and, indeed, could not have been materially different, without begetting erroneous impressions of the mind and character of God. So that in proceeding to read what belongs to the work and handwriting of Moses, we must never lose sight of the fact, that we are tracing the footsteps of One, whose ways on earth have ever been mainly designed to disclose the path to heaven, and whose procedure in the past was carefully planned to prepare the way for the events and issues of the "world to come."

The first point to which our attention is naturally turned, is the one already alluded to, respecting the condition of the Israelites, the heirs of promise, when this new stage of God's proceedings began to take its course. We find them not only in a distant country, but labouring there under the most grievous hardship and oppression. When this adverse position of affairs took its commencement, or how, we are not farther told, than in the statement that "a new king arose up over Egypt, who knew not Joseph,"—a statement which has not unfrequently been thought to indicate a change of dynasty in the reigning family of Egypt. This ignorance, it would seem, soon grew into estrangement, and that again into jealousy and hatred; for afraid lest the Israelites, who were increasing with great rapidity in numbers and influence, should become too powerful, and should usurp dominion over the country, or, at least, in time of war, prove a formidable enemy within the camp, the then reigning Pharaoh took counsel to afflict them with heavy burdens, and to keep them down by means of oppression.

It is quite possible there may have been peculiar circumstances connected with the civil affairs of Egypt, which tended to foster and strengthen this rising enmity, and seemed to justify the harsh and oppressive policy in which it showed itself. But we have quite enough to account for it, in the character which belonged to the family of Jacob, when they entered Egypt, coupled with the extraordinary increase and prosperity which attended them there. It was as a company of shepherds they were presented before Pharaoh, and the land of Goshen was assigned them for a dwelling place expressly on account of its rich pasturage.* But

* Gen. xlvii. 11, "And Joseph gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in

"every shepherd," it is said, "was an abomination to the Egyptians;" and with such a strong feeling against them in the national mind, nothing but an overpowering sense of the obligation under which the Egyptians lay to the Israelites, could have induced them to grant to this shepherd race such a settlement within their borders. Nor can it be wondered at that when the remembrance of the obligation ceased to be felt, another kind of treatment should have been experienced by the family of Jacob than what they at first received, and that the native, deep-seated repugnance to those who followed their mode of life, should discover itself. That there *was* such a repugnance is a well ascertained fact, apart altogether from the testimony of scripture; the monuments of Egypt furnish abundant evidence of it, as they constantly exhibit shepherds in an inferior or despicable point of view, sometimes even as the extreme of coarseness and barbarity, and the objects of unmingled contempt.* We cannot suppose this hatred towards shepherds to have arisen simply from their possessing flocks and herds; for we have the clearest evidence in the Pentateuch, that Pharaoh possessed these, and that they existed in considerable numbers throughout the land.† It seems rather to have been occasioned by the general character and habits of the nomade or shepherd tribes,‡ who have ever been averse to the arts of cultivation and civilized life, and most unscrupulous in seizing, when they had the opportunity, the fruits that have been raised by the industry and toil of others. From the earliest times the rich and fertile country of Egypt has suffered much from these marauding hordes of the desert, to whose incursions it lies open both on the east and on the west. And as the land of Goshen skirted the deserts of Arabia, where especially the Bedouin or wandering tribes from time immemorial have been accustomed to dwell, we can easily conceive how the native Egyptians would watch with jealousy and dread the rising power and importance of the Israel-

the best of the land, in the land of Rameses." "The land of Goshen," says Robinson in his Biblical Researches, "was the best of the land; and such, too, the province of Esh-Shŭrkîyeh has ever been, down to the present time. In the remarkable Arabic document translated by De Sacy, containing a valuation of all the provinces and villages of Egypt in the year 1376, this province comprises 383 towns and villages, and is valued at 1,411,875 *dinars*—a larger sum than is put on any other province, with one exception. During my stay in Cairo, I made many inquiries respecting this district; to which the uniform reply was, that it was considered the best province in Egypt. . . . There are here more flocks and herds than any where else in Egypt, and also more fishermen." Wilkinson also states, that no soil is better suited to many kinds of produce than the irrigated edge of the desert (where Goshen lay,) even before it is covered by the fertilizing deposit of the inundation."—*Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, i. p. 222. How such a rich and fertile region should have been so little occupied at the time of Jacob's descent into Egypt, as to afford room for his family settling in it, and enlarging themselves as they did, need occasion no anxiety, as the fact itself is indisputable.

* Rosellini, vol. i. p. 178. Wilkinson, vol. ii. p. 16; also Heeren's Africa, ii. p. 146, Trans.

† Gen. xlvii. 6, 16, 17. Ex. ix. 3, &c.

‡ See Heeren's Africa, ii. p. 157. Rosellini, Mon. dell' Eg. i. p. 177, &c. Hengstenberg, Beitr., ii. p. 437.

ites. By descent they were themselves allied with those shepherd tribes, and by the advantage of their position they held the key on an exposed side to the heart of the kingdom; so that, if they became strong enough, and chose to act in concert with their Arab neighbours, they might have overspread the land with desolation. Indeed, it is a historical fact, that "the Bedouin Arabs, settled in Egypt have always made common cause with the Arabs (of the Desert) against the communities that possessed the land. They fought against the Saracen dynasty in Egypt, against the Turkomans, as soon as they had acquired the ascendency, against the Mamlook Sultans, who were the successors of the Turkomans, and they have been at war with the Osmanlis without intermission, since they first set foot upon Egypt, more than 300 years ago."*

Hence, when the Israelites appear so remarkably to flourish and multiply in their new abode, it was no unnatural policy for the Egyptians to subject them to hard labour and vexatious burdens. They would thus expect to repress their increase, and break their spirit—and, by destroying what remained of their pastoral habits, and training them to the arts and institutions of civilized life, as these existed in Egypt, to lessen at once their desire and their opportunities of leaguing for any hostile purpose with the tribes of the desert. At the same time, while such reasons might sufficiently account for the commencement of a hard and oppressive policy, there was evidently other reasons connected at least with its further progress and deeper aggravation, and such as argued some acquaintance with the peculiar prospects of Israel. It was only *one* ground of Pharaoh's anxiety respecting them, that they might possibly join hands with an enemy, and fight against Egypt; another fear was, that they "might get them up out of the land."† This seems to speak a knowledge of the fact, that some other region than Goshen belonged to the Israelites, as their proper home, for which they were disposed, at a fitting time, to leave their habitations in Egypt. Nor, indeed, would it be difficult for the king of Egypt to obtain such knowledge, as, in the early period of their sojourn, the Israelites had no motive to hold it in concealment. Then the announcement of Jacob's dying command to carry up his remains to the land of Canaan, of which the whole court of Pharaoh was apprized, and afterwards the formal withdrawal of Joseph and his family from the families and affairs of Egypt, to identify themselves with the state and prospects of their kindred, were more than sufficient to excite the suspicion of a jealous and unfriendly government, that they did not expect to remain always

* Prokesch, Errinnerungen aus Eg. as quoted by Hengstenberg in his Eg. and the books of Moses, p. 78. If Egypt had previously been overrun, and for some generations held in bondage by one of these nomade tribes of Asia, there would have been a still stronger ground for exercising toward the family of Jacob the jealous antipathy in question. Of the fact of such an invasion, and possession of Egypt by a shepherd race, later investigations into the antiquities of Egypt have left little room to doubt; but the period of its occurrence, as connected with the history of the Israelites, is still a matter of uncertainty.

† Ex. i. 10.

connected with the land and fortunes of Egypt. "It is clear, that Pharaoh knew of a home for these stranger-Israelites, while he wished to have the thought of it banished from his mind; and that though his forefather had treated them to a possession in the land of Egypt, he now considered them as his servants, whom he was determined not to lose. It is precisely because he would know nothing of freedom and a home for Israel, that the increase of Israel was so great an annoyance to him. The seed of Abraham were, according to the promise, to be a blessing to all nations, and should, therefore, have been greeted with joy by the king of Egypt. But since the reverse was the case, we can easily see, at this aspect of Israel's affairs, that the further fulfilment of the promise could not develope itself by the straightest and most direct road, but would have to force its way through impediments of great strength and difficulty."*

The kinds of service which were imposed with so much rigour upon the Israelites, though they would doubtless comprehend the various trades and employments which were exercised in the land, consisted chiefly, as might be expected in such a country, in the several departments of field labour. It was especially "in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field, that their lives were made bitter with hard bondage."† The making of bricks formed of clay and straw appears, during the later period of the bondage, to have been the only servile occupation in which they were largely engaged, and, of course, along with that, the erection of the buildings for which the bricks were made. As the hard and rigorous service to which they were subjected in this department of labour did not seem to answer the end intended, but the more they were afflicted the more they multiplied and grew, the gloom and distress that hung around their condition were fearfully deepened by the issuing of a cruel edict, commanding that their male children should be killed as soon as they were born. This was too atrocious an edict even for the despot of a heathen land to enforce, as he could not find instruments at his command wicked enough to carry it into execution. In all probability it was soon recalled, or allowed gradually to fall into neglect; for though it was in force at the birth of Moses, we hear nothing of it afterwards; and its only marked effect, so far as we are informed, was to furnish the occasion of opening a way for that future deliverer into the palaces and temples of Egypt: so marvellously did God, by his overruling providence, baffle the design of the enemy, and compel "the eater to give forth meat!" The only evil in their condition which seems to have become general and permanent, was the hard service in brick-making and collateral kinds of servile labour, and which, so far from suffering relaxation by length of time, was rather, on slight pretexts, increased and aggravated. It became at last so excessive, that one universal cry of misery and distress arose from the once happy land of Goshen—a cry which entered into the ear of the God of Abraham, and which

* Baumgarten, Theol. Com. i. p. 393. † Ex. i. 14; v.

would no longer permit him to remain an inactive spectator of a controversy, which, if continued, must have made void his covenant with the father of the faithful.*

So much for the condition itself of hard bondage and oppressive labour to which the heirs of the inheritance were reduced, before the time came for their being actually put in possession of its blessings. And situated as they were within the bounds of a foreign kingdom, at first naturally jealous, and then openly hostile towards them, it is not difficult to account for the kind of treatment inflicted on them, viewing the position they occupied merely in its worldly relations and interests. But what account can we give of it in its religious aspect? As an arrangement settled and ordained on the part of God? Why should he have ordained such a state of matters concerning his chosen seed? For the Egyptians, "though their hearts thought not so," were but instruments in his hands, to bring to pass what the Lord had long before announced to Abraham as certainly to take place, namely, that his "seed should be strangers in a land that was not theirs, and should serve them, and be afflicted by them four hundred years."

1. Considered in this higher point of view the first light in which it naturally presents itself is that of a doom or punishment, from which, as interested in the mercy of God, they needed redemption. For the aspect of intense suffering which it latterly assumed could

* A modern infidel (Von Bohlen, Einleitung zur Genesis) has attempted to throw discredit on the above account of the hard service of the Israelites, by alleging that the making of bricks at that early period belonged only to the region of Babylonia, and that the early Egyptians were accustomed to build with hewn stone. "We can scarcely trust our own eyes," says Hengstenberg, "when we read such things," and justly, as all well informed writers concerning ancient Egypt, whether of earlier or of later times, have concurred in testifying that building with brick was very common there, so common, that private edifices were generally of that material. Herodotus mentions a pyramid of brick, which is thought to be one of those still standing, (ii. 136.) Modern inquirers, such as Champollion, Rossellini and Wilkinson, speak of tombs, ruins of great buildings, lofty walls and pyramids, being formed of bricks, and found in all parts of Egypt. (See the quotations in Hengstenberg's Eg. and books of Moses, p. 2, 80.) Wilkinson says (Ancient Egyptians, ii. p. 57,) "The use of crude brick, baked in the sun, was universal in Upper and Lower Egypt, both for public and private buildings; and the brick-field gave abundant occupation to numerous labourers throughout the country. . . . Enclosures of gardens or granaries, sacred circuits encompassing the courts of temples, walls of fortifications and towns, dwelling-houses and tombs, in short, all but the temples themselves were of crude brick; and so great was the demand, that the Egyptian government, observing the profit which would accrue from a monopoly of them, undertook to supply the public at a moderate price, thus preventing all unauthorized persons from engaging in the manufacture. And in order the more effectually to obtain this end, the seal of the king, or of some privileged person, was stamped upon the bricks at the time they were made." He says further, "It is worthy of remark, that more bricks bearing the name of Thothmes II. (whom I suppose to have been king of Egypt at the time of the Exodus,) have been discovered than of any other period." And not only have multitudes of bricks been thus identified with the period of Israel's bondage, and these always made of clay mingled with chopped straw, but a picture has been discovered in a tomb at Thebes, which so exactly corresponds with the delineation given by Moses of the hard service of the Israelites—some carrying the clay in vessels, others mingling straw in it, others again taking the bricks out of the form, and placing them in rows, these labourers of Asiatic, not Egyptian aspect, but amongst them four Egyptians, two of whom carry sticks in their hands, taskmasters —that Rossellini has not hesitated to call it "a picture representing the Hebrews, as they were engaged in making brick."

only be regarded as an act of retribution for their past unfaithfulness and sins. We would be perfectly warranted to infer this, even without any express information on the subject, from the general connexion in the divine government between sin and suffering. And when placed by the special appointment of Heaven in circumstances so peculiarly marked by what was painful and afflicting to nature, the Israelites should then, no doubt, have read in their marred condition, what their posterity were, in like circumstances, taught to read by the prophet, "that it was their own wickedness which corrected them, and their backslidings which reproved them." But we are not simply warranted to draw this as an inference. It is matter of historical certainty, brought out in the course of the Mosaic narrative by many and painful indications, that the Israelites were not long in Egypt till they became partakers in Egypt's sins, and that, the longer their stay was protracted there, they only sunk the deeper into the mire of Egyptian idolatry and corruption, and became the more thoroughly alienated from the true knowledge and worship of God. Not only had they, as a people, completely lost sight of the great temporal promise of the covenant, the inheritance of the land of Canaan, but God himself had become to them as a strange God; so that Moses had to inquire for the name by which he would reveal him to their now dark and besotted minds.* The very same language is used concerning their connexion with the abominations of Egyptian idolatry, while they sojourned among them, as is afterwards used of their connexion with those of Canaan: they served "other Gods," "went a whoring after them," and even long after they had left the region, would not "forsake the idols of Egypt," but still carried its abominations with them, and in their hearts turned back to it.† Of the truth of these charges they gave too many affecting proofs in the wilderness; and especially by their setting up, so recently after the awful demonstrations of God's presence and glory on Sinai, and their own covenant engagements, the worship of the golden calf, with its bacchanalian accompaniments. For their conduct on that occasion was plainly a return to the idolatrous practices of Egypt in their most common form.‡ Indeed, if their bondage and op-

* Ex. iii. 13.

† Josh. xxiv. 14; Lev. xvii. 7; Ez. xxiii. 3; xx. 8; Amos v. 25, 26; Acts vii. 39.

‡ It is admitted on all hands, that the worship of the gods under symbolical images of irrational creatures, had its origin in Egypt, and was especially cultivated there in connexion with the cow or bovine form. It was noticed by Strabo, l. xvii., as singular, that "no image formed after the human figure was to be found in the temples of Egypt, but only that of some beasts," (*των αλογων ζωων τινος.*) And no images seem to have been so generally used as those of the calf or cow—though authors differ as to the particular deity represented by it. It would rather seem that there were several deities worshipped under this symbol. Most of the available learning on the subject has been brought together by Bochart, Hieroz. Lib. ii. chap. 34; to which Hengstenberg has made some additions in his Beit. ii. p. 155—163. The latter would connect the worship of the golden calf in the desert with the worship of Apis; Wilkinson connects it with that of Mnevis, (Manners of Ancient Eg. 2d series, ii. p. 96,) and Jerome had already given it as his opinion, that Jeroboam set up the two golden calves in Dan and Bethel, in imitation of the Apis and Mnevis of Egypt, (Com. on Hos. iv. 15.) But however that may be, there can be no doubt, that if the Israelites were disposed to Egyptize in their worship, the

pression in its earlier stages did not, as a timely chastisement from the hand of God, check their tendency to imitate the manners and corruptions of Egypt, as it does not appear to have done, it must have had the effect of leading them into a still closer conformity with these. For it destroyed that freedom and elevation of spirit without which genuine religion can never prosper; it robbed them of the leisure they required for the worship of God and the cultivation of their minds (their Sabbaths seem altogether to have perished,) and it brought them into such close contact with the proper possessors of Egypt, as was naturally calculated to infect them with the grovelling and licentious spirit of Egyptian idolatry. So that probably true religion was never at a lower ebb in the family of Abraham than toward the close of their sojourn in Egypt; and the swelling waves of affliction, which at last overwhelmed them, only marked the excessive strength and prevalence of that deep under-current of corruption which had carried them away.

Now this condition of the heirs of promise, viewed in reference to its highest bearing, in connexion with the inheritance, was made subservient to the manifestation of certain great principles, necessarily involved in this part of the divine procedure, in respect to which it could not properly have been dispensed with. (1. It first of all clearly demonstrated, that, apart from the covenant of God, the state and prospects of those heirs of promise were in no respect better than those of other men—in some respects it seemed to be worse with them. They were equally far off from the inheritance, being in a state of hopeless alienation from it; they had drunk into the foul and abominable pollutions of the land of their present sojourn, which were utterly at variance with an interest in the promised blessing; and they bore upon them the yoke of a galling bondage, at once the consequence and the sign of their spiritual degradation. They differed for the better only in having a part in the covenant of God. (2.) Therefore, secondly, whatever this covenant secured for them of promised good, it must have secured purely of grace. In so far as they looked to themselves, they could see no ground of preference—they saw, indeed, the very reverse of any title to the blessing which must hence descend upon them as Heaven's free and undeserved gift. This, they were afterwards admonished by Moses to keep carefully in remembrance: "Speak not thou in thy heart, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land. Not for thy righteousness or the uprightness of thine heart dost thou go to possess the land, but that the Lord may perform the word which he sware unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and

most likely and natural method for them to do so, was by forming to themselves the image of a golden cow or calf, and then by engaging in its worship with noisy and festive rites. For it is admitted by those (for example, Creuzer, Symbol. i. p. 448,) who are little in the habit of making any concessions in favour of a passage of scripture, that the rites of the Egyptians partook much of the nature of orgies, and that the fundamental character of their religion was bacchanalian.

Jacob." Deut. ix. 4—6. (3.) Hence, finally, the promise of the inheritance could be made good in their experience only by the special kindness and interposition of God, vindicating the truth of his own faithful word, and in order to this, executing in their behalf a work of redemption. While the inheritance was sure, because the title to it stood in the mercy and faithfulness of God, they had of necessity to be redeemed before they could actually possess it. Having become the victims of corruption, they were also the children of wrath; sin had brought them into bondage; and before they could escape to the land of freedom and rest, the snare must be broken. But the hand of Omnipotence alone could do it; if nature had been left to itself, the result would only have been a fouler corruption and a deeper ruin; as the Lord's chosen people they held the promise of the inheritance, and as his ransomed ones they must be brought to possess it. So that the great principles of their degenerate and lost condition, of the sovereignty and freedom of their election to the promised good, of redemption by the grace and power of God in order to obtain it, were interwoven as essential elements with this portion of their history, and imprinted as indelible lines upon the very foundations of their national existence.

The parallel here, in each particular, between the earthly and the spiritual, the temporal and the eternal, or, as we more commonly term it, between the type and the antitype, must so readily present itself to all who are conversant with New Testament Scripture, that we need do nothing more than indicate the agreement. It is most expressly declared, and indeed is implied in the whole plan of redemption unfolded in the gospel, that those who become heirs of salvation are, in their natural state no better than other men—they are members of the same fallen family—the same elements of corruption work in them—they are children of wrath, even as others.* When, therefore, it is asked, who makes them to differ, so that while others perish in their sins, they obtain the blessed hope of everlasting life? The only answer that can be returned is, the free and sovereign riches of the grace of God; the confession of Paul for himself, is equally suited to the whole company of the faithful, "By the grace of God I am what I am;" nor is there a blessing of life here, or a ray of glory hereafter, that any of them may experience, of which he shall have any other account to give, than that it has flowed from the undeserved mercy and goodness of God.† And when this distinguishing grace of God comes down to develope itself in the personal history of men, and to bring them to the possession of its elevated prospects, how can it possibly proceed, but by the execution in their behalf of a supernatural deliverance? The difference is so great between what they naturally are, and what through grace they are to become, that a redemption-process must of necessity form the bridge between the two. As the everlasting inheritance, to the hope of which they are

* Eph. ii. 1—3; Rom. iii. 9—20; vii.; Matth. ix. 13; Luke xiii. 3, &c.
† 1 Cor. iv. 7; xv. 10; Eph. i. 4; John iii. 27; vi. 44; Matth. xi. 25; Phil. i. 29, &c.

begotten, is entirely the gift of God, so the way which leads to it can be no other than that which his own outstretched arm has opened up for them; and if, as God's elect, they are called to the inheritance, it is as his redeemed that they go to possess it.*

2. We have as yet, however, mentioned only one ultimate reason for the oppressed and suffering condition of the Israelites in Egypt, though in that one were involved various principles bearing upon their relation to the inheritance. But there was another also of great importance—it formed an essential part of the preparation which they needed for occupying the inheritance. This preparation, in its full and proper sense, must, of course, have included qualities of a religious and moral kind—and of these we shall have occasion to speak at large afterwards; but apart from these, there was needed what might be called a natural preparation; and that especially consisting of two parts—a sufficient desire after the inheritance, and a fitness in temper and habit for the position, in connexion with it, which they were destined to occupy.

(1.) It was necessary by some means to have a desire awakened in their bosoms toward Canaan; for this had vanished from their sight, amid the pleasures and advantages of Goshen. The Lord had never intended that Goshen should be to them as a home, or more than a temporary place of sojourn. But the human heart, in its depravity, is so prone to abuse the gifts of Divine Providence, and pervert them to ends the very reverse of those for which they are conferred, that this pleasant habitation soon became a snare to them. The fulness of its natural delights by degrees took off their thoughts from their high calling and destiny as the church of God, and the more they degenerated into the corrupt and sensual spirit of Egypt, the more would they always be disposed to sit down "in measureless content" with their present comforts. So much had this actually become the case with them, that they could scarcely be kept from returning back to it, notwithstanding the hard service, and crying afflictions with which their lives had latterly been made bitter in it. What must have been their views and feelings if no such troubles had been experienced, and all had continued to go well with them in Egypt? How vain would have been the attempt to inspire them with the love of Canaan, and especially to make good their way to it through formidable difficulties and appalling dangers?

The affliction of Israel in Egypt is a testimony to the truth, common to all times, that the kingdom of God must be entered through tribulation. The tribulation may be ever so varied in its character and circumstances. But in some form it must be experienced, so as to fill the mind with dissatisfaction in regard to its temporal portion, and kindle within it a sincere desire for the better part, which is reserved in heaven for the heirs of salvation. Hence it is so peculiarly hard for those who are living in the midst of fulness and prosperity to enter into the kingdom of God. And hence, also, must so many visitations of trouble be sent even to those who

* Eph. i. 6, 7, 18, 19; Col. i. 12—14; 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; Heb. ii. 14, 15; 1 Pet. i. 3—5, &c.

have entered the kingdom, to wean them from earthly things, and hedge up their way toward their home and portion in heaven.

(2.) But if we look once more to the Israelites, we shall see that something besides longing desire for Canaan was needed to prepare them for what was in prospect. For that land, though presented to their hopes as a land flowing with milk and honey, was not to be by any means a region of inactive repose—where every thing was to be done for them, and they had only to take their rest, and feast themselves with the abundance of peace. The natural imagination delights to riot in the thought of such an untaxed existence, and such a luxurious home. But He who made man, and knows what is best suited to the powers and capacities of his nature, never destined him for such a state of being. Even the garden of Eden, the blessed region of his first inheritance, replenished as it was with the tokens of divine beneficence, was, to some extent, a field of active exertion: Adam was appointed to keep it, at the same time that he was permitted freely to enjoy its stores of delight. And now, when Canaan took for a time the place of Eden, and the church was directed to look thither for its present home and inheritance, while she was warranted to expect there the largest amount of earthly blessing, she was by no means entitled to look for a state of lazy inaction and uninterrupted rest. There was much to be done, as well as much to be enjoyed, and she could neither have fulfilled, in regard to other nations, the elevated destiny to which she was appointed, as the lamp and witness of Heaven, nor reaped in her own experience the large measure of good which was laid up in store for herself, unless she had been prepared by a peculiar training of vigorous action, and even compulsive labour, to make the proper use of all her advantages. Now, in this point of view, the period of Israel's childhood as a nation in Egypt, might be regarded as, to some extent, a season of preparation for their future manhood. It would not have done for them to go and take possession of Canaan as a horde of ignorant barbarians, or as a company of undisciplined and unsettled shepherds. It was fit and proper that they should carry with them a taste for the arts and manners of civilized life, and habits of active labour, suited to the scenes of usefulness and glory which awaited them in the land of their proper inheritance. But how were such tastes and habits to become theirs? They did not naturally possess them, nor, if left to themselves, would they probably ever have acquired them in any competent degree. They must be brought, in the first instance, under the bonds of a strong necessity; so that it might be no doubtful contingence, but a certain and general result, their leaving Egypt with all the learning, the knowledge of art and manufacture, the capacity for active business and useful employment, which it was possible for them there to acquire. And thus they went forth abundantly furnished with the natural gifts which were necessary to render them, not only an independent nation, but also, fit instruments of God for his work

and service, in the new and not less honourable than arduous position they were destined to occupy.*

The correspondence here between the type and the antitype has been too much overlooked, and even the more direct intimations of New Testament Scripture respecting the state and employment of saints in glory, have too seldom been admitted to their full extent, and followed out to their legitimate practical results, as regards the condition of believers on earth. The truth, in this respect, however, has been so finely developed by one living author, that we must take leave to present it in his own words. "Heaven—the ultimate and perfected condition of human nature, is thought of, amidst the toils of life, as an elysium of quiescent bliss, exempt, if not from action, at least from the necessity of action. Meanwhile, every one feels that the ruling tendency and the uniform intention of all the arrangements of the present state, and of almost all its casualties, is to generate and to cherish habits of strenuous exertion. Inertness, not less than vice, is a seal of perdition. The whole course of nature, and all the institutions of society, and the ordinary course of events, and the explicit will of

* The view given in the text may be said to strike a middle course between that of Kitto, in his History of Palestine, vol. i. p. 150, &c., and that of Hengstenberg, in his Authen. I. p. 431, &c. (We mention these two writers, chiefly as being among the last who have held respectively the views in question, not as if there was any thing substantially new in either. Deyling has a clear, and in the main, well conducted argumentation for the view adopted by Hengstenberg, and against the opposite, at the end of P. I. of his Obs. Sac.) The former regards the Israelites, at the period of their descent into Egypt, as distinguished by all the characteristics of the wandering and barbarous shepherd tribes, and not improbably giving occasion at first, by some overt acts of plunder, to the Egyptian government to adopt harsh measures toward them. Most German writers of the rationalist school not only go to the full length in maintaining this, but, apparently forgetting the discipline to which the Israelites were subjected in Egypt, consider it to have been their condition also when they left the country; and object to the account given of the erection of the tabernacle in the wilderness, as implying too much skill in various kinds of arts and manufacture for a simple shepherd race. So, in particular, Winer and Vatke. Hengstenberg, on the other hand, maintains that the roughness and barbarity properly distinguishing the shepherd tribes never belonged to the Hebrews—that their possessing the character of shepherds at all, arose chiefly from the circumstances in which they were placed during their early sojourn in Canaan—that they were glad to abandon their wandering life and dwell in settled habitations, whenever an opportunity offered—that, set down, as they afterwards were, in one of the most fertile and cultivated regions of Egypt, which they held from the first as a settled possession, (Gen. xlvii. 11, 27,) their manner of life was throughout different from the nomadic, was distinguished by possessions in lands and houses, and by the various employments and comforts peculiar to Egyptian society. This view must be adopted, with some modification as to the earlier periods of their history; for, though the Israelites never entered fully into the habits of the nomade tribes, yet they were manifestly tending more and more in that direction, toward the time of their descent into Egypt. The tendency was there gradually checked, and the opposite extreme at last reached—as it appears, that at the time of the Exodus they had all houses with door-posts (Ex. xii. 4, 7, &c.,) lived to a considerable extent intermingled with the Egyptians in their cities, (Ex. iii. 20—22; xi. 1—3; xii. 35, 36,) were accustomed to the agricultural occupations peculiar to the country, (Deut. xi. 10,) took part even in its finest manufactures, such as were prepared for the king, (1 Chron. iv. 21—23,) and enjoyed the best productions both of the river and the land, (Num. xi. 5; xx. 5.) It is but natural to suppose, however, that some compulsion was requisite to bring them to this state of civilization and refinement; and as it was a state necessary to fit them for setting up the tabernacle and occupying aright the land of Canaan, we see the overruling hand of God in the very compulsion that was exercised.

God declared in his Word, concur in opposing that propensity to rest which belongs to the human mind; and combine to necessitate submission to the hard, yet salutary conditions, under which alone the most extreme evils may be held in abeyance, and any degree of happiness enjoyed. A task and duty is to be fulfilled, in discharging which the want of energy is punished even more immediately and more severely than the want of virtuous motives."

He proceeds to show that the notices we have of the heavenly world, imply the existence there of intelligent and vigorous agents:—

"But if there be a real and necessary, not merely a shadowy, agency in heaven as well as on earth; and if human nature is destined to act its part in such an economy, then its constitution, and the severe training it undergoes, are at once explained; and then also the removal of individuals in the very prime of their fitness for useful labour, ceases to be impenetrably mysterious. This excellent mechanism of matter and mind, which, beyond any other of his works, declares the wisdom of the Creator, and which, under his guidance, is now passing the season of its first preparation, shall stand up anew from the dust of dissolution, and then, with freshened powers, and with a store of hard-earned and practical wisdom for its guidance, shall essay new labours in the service of God, who by such instruments chooses to accomplish his designs of beneficence. That so prodigious a waste of the highest qualities should take place, as is implied in the notions which many Christians entertain of the future state, is indeed hard to imagine. The mind of man, formed as it is to be more tenacious of its active habits than even of its moral dispositions, is, in the present state, trained often at an immense cost of suffering, to the exercise of skill, of forethought, of courage, of patience; and ought it not to be inferred—unless positive evidence contradicts the supposition, that this system of education bears some relation of fitness to the state for which it is an initiation? Shall not the very same qualities, which here are so sedulously fashioned and finished, be actually needed and used in that future world of perfection? Surely the idea is inadmissible, that an instrument wrought up at so much expense, to a polished fitness for service, is destined to be suspended for ever on the palace-walls of heaven, as a glittering bauble, no more to make proof of its temper.

"Perhaps a pious, but needless jealousy, lest the honour due to Him, 'who worketh all in all,' should be in any degree compromised, has had influence in concealing from the eyes of Christians the importance attributed in the Scriptures to subordinate agency; and thus, by a natural consequence, has impoverished and enfeebled our ideas of the heavenly state. But assuredly, it is only while encompassed by the dimness and errors of the present life, that there can be any danger of attributing to the creature the glory due to the Creator. When once with open eye that excellent glory has been contemplated, then shall it be understood that the divine wisdom is incomparably more honoured by the skilful

and faithful performances, and by the cheerful toils of agents who have been fashioned and fitted for service, than it could be by the bare exertions of irresistible power; and then, when the absolute dependence of creatures is thoroughly felt—may the beautiful orders of the heavenly hierarchy—rising and still rising toward perfection, be seen and admired, without hazard of forgetting Him, who alone is absolutely perfect, and who is the only fountain and first cause of whatever is excellent."*

It is only further to be noticed here, that, as preparation of this kind is necessary for the future occupations and destinies of God's people, so in their case now, as in that of the Israelites in Egypt, a method of dealing may even in that respect require to be taken with them very different from what they themselves desire, and such as no present considerations can satisfactorily explain. When so dealt with, they should remember the word of Christ to Peter: —"What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." The way by which they are led appears strange, perhaps, and more encompassed with hardships and difficulty than is meet; but it is so only because they cannot trace with sufficient clearness the many threads of connexion between the present and the future —between the course of preparation in time and the condition in eternity. Let them trust the paternal guidance and sure foresight of Him who can trace it with unerring certainty, and they shall doubtless find in the issue, that every thing in their lot has been arranged with infinite skill, to adapt them to the state, the employments and services of heaven.

CHAPTER II.

THE DELIVERER AND HIS COMMISSION.

THE condition to which the heirs of promise were reduced in the land of Egypt, we have seen, called for a deliverance, and this again for a deliverer. Both were to be pre-eminently of God—the work itself, and the main instrument of accomplishing it. In the execution of the one there was not more need for the display of divine power than for the exercise of divine wisdom in the selection and preparation of the other. It is peculiar to God's instruments, that, though commonly at first they appear the least suited for the service, they are found on trial to possess the highest qualifications. "Wisdom is justified of all her children," but especially of those who are appointed to the most arduous and important undertakings.

But in the extremity of Israel's distress, where was a deliverer

* Natural History of Enthusiasm, p. 150—154.

to be found with the requisite qualifications? From a family of bondsmen, crushed and broken in spirit by their miserable servitude, who was to have the boldness to undertake their deliverance, or the wisdom, if he should succeed in delivering them, to make suitable arrangements for their future guidance and discipline? Who was likely at such a time even to gain *their* confidence as appearing in any measure equal to the task? If such a person was any where to be found, he must evidently have been one who had enjoyed advantages very superior to those which entered into the common lot of his brethren—who had found time and opportunity for the meditation of high thoughts, and the acquirement of such varied gifts as fitted him to transact, in behalf of his oppressed countrymen, with the court of the proud and the learned Pharaohs, and amidst the greatest difficulties and discouragements to lay the foundation of a system which was to nurture and develope through coming ages the religious life of God's covenant people. Such a deliverer was needed for this peculiar emergency in the affairs of God's kingdom, and the very troubles which seemed from their long continuance and crushing severity to preclude the possibility of obtaining what was needed, were made to work toward its accomplishment.

It is not the least interesting and instructive point in the history of Moses, the future hope of the church, that his first appearance on the stage of this troubled world, was in the darkest hour of affliction, when the adversary was driving things to the uttermost. He began to breathe under a doom of death, and the very preservation of his life was a miracle of divine mercy. But the Lord "makes the wrath of man to praise him," and the bloody decree, which, by destroying the male children as they were born, was designed by Pharaoh to inflict the death-blow on Israel's hopes of honour and enlargement, was rendered subservient, in the case of Moses, to prepare and fashion the living instrument, through whom these hopes were soon to be carried forth into victory and fruition. Forced by the very urgency of the danger on the notice of Pharaoh's daughter, and thereafter received under her care and patronage into Pharaoh's house, the child Moses possessed, in the highest degree, the opportunity of becoming "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and grew up to manhood in the familiar use of every advantage which it was possible for the world at that time to confer. But with such extraordinary means of advancement for the natural life, with what an atmosphere of danger was he there encompassed for the spiritual! He was exposed to the seductive and pernicious influence of a palace, where not only the world was met with in its greatest pomp and splendour, but where also superstition reigned, and a policy was pursued directly opposed to the interests of God's king. How he was enabled to withstand such dangerous influences, and escape the contamination of so unwholesome a region we are not informed; nor even how he first became acquainted with the fact of his Hebrew origin, and the better prospects which still remained to cheer and animate the

hearts of his countrymen. But the result shows, that somehow he was preserved from the one, and brought to the knowledge of the other; for when about forty years of age, we are told, he went forth to visit his brethren, and that, with a faith already so fully formed, that he was not only prepared to sympathize with them in their distress, but to hazard all for their deliverance.* And, indeed, when he once understood and believed that his brethren were the covenant people of God, who held in promise the inheritance of the land of Canaan, and whose period of oppression he might also have learned was drawing near its termination, it would hardly require any special revelation, besides what might be gathered from the singular providences attending his earlier history, to conclude that he was destined by God to be the chosen instrument for effecting the deliverance.

But it is often less difficult to get the principle of faith, than to exercise the patience necessary in waiting God's time for its proper and seasonable exercise. Moses showed he possessed the one, but seems yet to have wanted the other, when he slew the Egyptian whom he found smiting the Hebrew. For though the motive was good, being intended to express his brotherly sympathy with the suffering Israelites, and to serve as a kind of signal for a general rising against their oppressors, yet the action itself appears to have been wrong. He had no warrant to take the execution of vengeance into his own hand; and that it was with this view, rather than for any purpose of defence, that Moses went so far as to slay the Egyptian, seems not obscurely intimated in the original narrative, and is more distinctly implied in the assertion of Stephen, that "he supposed they would thereby have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them." The consequence was, that by anticipating the purpose of God, and setting about the work in an improper manner, he only involved himself in danger and difficulty; his own brethren misunderstood his conduct, and Pharaoh threatened to take away his life. On this occasion, therefore, we cannot but regard him as acting unadvisedly with his hand, as on a future one he spake unadvisedly with his lips; it was the hasty and irregular impulse of the flesh, not the enlightened and heavenly guidance of the Spirit, which prompted him to take the course he did; and without contributing in the least to improve the condition of his countrymen, he was himself made to reap the fruit of his misconduct in a long and dreary exile.†

* Ex. ii. 11—15; Acts vii. 23; Heb. xi. 24.

† We can scarcely have a better specimen of the characteristic difference between the stern impartiality of ancient inspired history, and the falsely-coloured partiality of what is merely human, than in the accounts preserved of the first part of Moses' life in the Bible and Josephus respectively. All is plain, unadorned narrative in the one, a faithful record of facts as they took place, while in the other, every thing appears enveloped in the wonderful and miraculous. A prediction goes before the birth of Moses to announce how much was to depend upon it—a divine vision is also given concerning it to Amram—the mother is spared the usual pains of labour—the child when discovered by Pharaoh's daughter refuses to suck any breast but that of its mother—when grown a little, he becomes so beautiful that strangers must needs turn back and look after him, &c. But with all these unwarranted additions, in the

We cannot therefore justify Moses in the deed he committed, far less say of him with Buddeus, (Hist. Eccles. Vet. Test. i. p. 492,) Patrick and others, that he was stirred up to it by a divine impulse, nor regard the impulse of any other kind, than that which prompted David's men to counsel him to slay Saul, when stretched helpless and alone in the cave (1 Sam. xxiv.)—an impulse of the flesh presuming upon, and misapplying a word of God. The time for deliverance was not yet come. The Israelites as a whole were not sufficiently prepared for it. Their affliction, indeed, had already become almost intolerable; but as the then reigning monarch of Egypt was probably the first who had treated them with any degree of harshness, they would endure through his reign in the hopes of seeing better days, when another ascended the throne; and it would only be, when they saw that successor determined to pursue the same cruel policy, with an aggravation rather than an abatement of its rigour, that they would be disposed to hail the prospect of a deliverance. But Moses himself also yet wanted much to complete his preparation. Other and very different elements required to mingle in his previous training, besides such as he could acquire in Egypt. Before he was qualified to take the government of such a people, and be a fit instrument for executing the manifold and arduous part he had to discharge in connexion with them, he needed to have trial of a kind of life precisely the reverse of what he had been accustomed to in the palaces of Egypt—to feel himself at home amid the desolation and solitudes of the desert, and there to become habituated to solemn converse with his God, and formed to the requisite gravity, meekness, patience, and subduedness of spirit. Thus God overruled his too rash and hasty interference with the affairs of his kindred, to the proper completion of his own preparatory training, and provided for him the advantage of as long a sojourn in the wilderness to learn divine wisdom, as he had already spent in learning human wisdom in Egypt. We have no direct information of the manner in which his spirit was exercised, during this period of exile, yet the names he gave to his children show, that it did not pass unimproved. The first he called Gershom, "Because he was a stranger in a strange land,"—implying, that he felt in the inmost depths of his soul the sadness of being cut off from the society of his kindred, and perhaps also at being disappointed of his hope in regard to the promised inheritance. The second he named Eliezer, saying, "The God of my father is my help,"—betokening his clear, realizing faith in the invisible Je-

true spirit of Jewish, or rather human partiality, not a word is said of his killing the Egyptian; he is obliged to flee, indeed, but only because of the envy of the Egyptians for having delivered them from the Ethiopians, (Antiq. ii. 9, 10, 11.) In Scripture his act in killing the Egyptian is not expressly condemned as sinful; but, as often happens there, this is clearly enough indicated by the results in providence growing out of it. Many commentators justify Moses in smiting the Egyptian, on the ground of his being moved to it by a divine impulse. There can be no doubt, that he *supposed* himself to have had such an impulse, but that is a different thing from his actually having it, and Augustine judged rightly, when he thought Moses could not be altogether justified, "quia nullam adhuc legitimam potestatem gerebat, nec acceptam divinitus, nec humana societate ordinatam."—Quæst. in Exodum, § ii.

hovah, the God of his fathers, to whom his soul had now learnt more thoroughly and confidently to turn itself, since he had been compelled so painfully to look away from the world. And now having passed through the school of God in its two grand departments, and in both extremes of life obtained ample opportunities for acquiring the wisdom which was peculiarly needed for Israel's deliverer and lawgiver, the set time for God was come, and he appeared in mercy to give Moses his divine commission for the task.

But here a new and unlooked for difficulty presents itself in his own reluctance to receive the commission. In any great enterprise, which concerns the welfare of many, though one has to take the lead, we know how apt a rash and unsuccessful attempt to accomplish the desired end is to beget a spirit of excessive caution and timidity—a sort of shyness and chagrin—especially if the failure has seemed in any measure attributable to a want of sympathy and support on the part of those whose co-operation was most confidently relied on. Something not unlike this appears to have grown upon Moses in the desert. Remembering how his precipitate attempt to avenge the wrongs of his kindred, and rouse them to a combined effort to regain their freedom, had not only provoked the displeasure of Pharaoh, but was met by insult and reproach from his kindred themselves, he could not but feel, that the work of their deliverance was likely to prove both a heartless and a perilous task—a work, that would need to be wrought out, not only against the determined opposition of the mightiest kingdom in the world, but also under the most trying discouragements, arising from the now degraded and dastardly spirit of the people. This feeling, of which Moses could scarcely fail to be conscious even at the time of his flight from Egypt, may easily be conceived to have increased in no ordinary degree, amid the deep solitudes and quiet occupations of a shepherd's life, in which he was permitted to live till he had the weight of fourscore years upon his head. So that we cannot wonder at the disposition he manifested to start objections to the proposal made to him to undertake the work of deliverance, but only at the unreasonable and daring length, to which, in spite of every consideration and remonstrance on the part of God, he persisted in urging them.

The symbol in which the Lord then appeared to Moses, the bush burning, but not consumed, was well fitted on reflection to inspire him with encouragement and hope. It pointed, Moses could not fail to remember, when he came to meditate on what he had seen and heard, to "the smoking furnace and the burning lamp," which had passed in vision before the eye of Abraham, when he was told of the future sufferings of his posterity in the land that was not theirs. (Gen. xv. 17.) Such a furnace now again visibly presented itself, but the little thorn-bush, emblem of the covenant-people, the tree of God's planting, stood uninjured in the midst of the flame, because the covenant God himself was there. Why, then, should Moses despond on account of the afflictions of his people, or shrink from the arduous task now committed to him?

Especially when the distinct assurance was given to him of all needful powers and gifts to furnish him aright for the undertaking, and the word of God was solemnly pledged to conduct it to a successful issue.

It is clear from the whole interview, at which Moses received his commission, that the difficulties and discouragements which pressed most upon his mind, were those connected with the sunk and degenerate condition of the covenant-people themselves, who appeared to him hopelessly dead to the promise of the covenant, and even estranged from the knowledge of the God of their Fathers. His concern on the latter point led him to ask what he should say to them, when they inquired for the name of the God of their fathers, in whose name he was to go to them? His question was met with the sublime reply, "I AM THAT I AM; thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, JEHOVAH, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."* When God thus claims to himself, and commands his servant to make him known to others, by a name which so peculiarly expresses his eternal being and Godhead, how immeasurably does he raise himself to the view of his people above the idolatrous atmosphere of Egypt! Nor was the idea, as some have alleged, too abstract and sublime for those to whom it was at first presented. For while unquestionably it is fitted to suggest thoughts of God, which the most enlightened and elevated mind must ever feel itself inadequate fully to comprehend, it at the same time presented him in a character peculiarly suited to the circumstances in which they were then placed. The name here, as usual in Scripture, was not assumed as an arbitrary, or even as a general designation, but as a particular, distinctive appellation, expressive of what God was in reference to them, for whose immediate behoof it was assumed. It was the manifestation of his peculiar and dis-

* Ex. iii. 14, 15. "From this passage we learn, 1. That יהוה (Jehovah) is to be derived from הוה, which is the same with היה (to be.) 2. That it is the third person of the future. For it is certain, that אהיה (I am) which God uses when speaking in his own person, is the first person future, and not less so, that יהוה (Jehovah) which he delivers to his people to be used when speaking of him, is the third. 3. We further learn that the name is to be taken in the signification of The Being, The Existing One; as the LXX. already render it by ὁ ὤν; and that the ground for the choice of this name is that which is given by John Damascene, viz., that it is the most suitable name of God, 'since he comprehends in himself every thing that is, like a certain boundless and infinite ocean of being.' . . . . If God is who he is, that is, constantly the same, the unchangeable, so is he also the Existing One, or the absolute Being, and if he is the absolute Being, he is also the unchangeable; as Malachi, (ch. iii. 6,) from the expression, 'I am Jehovah,' draws the conclusion, 'I change not.' Of every thing, which relatively is not being, it may be said: I am not that I am. Whatever is made does not continue uniformly alike, but in certain circumstances is unlike itself. Only God properly is, because the BEING is constantly the same, and because the constantly the same is the Being."—HENGSTENBERG, Authen. i. p. 244.—6. The meaning of the term Jehovah is given in Rev. i. 4. 8, Heb. xiii. 8, and being applied to Christ, they assert in the strongest language his essential Godhead.

tinguishing character, with special reference to that covenant-relation, which, since the time of Abraham, he held toward them. It told them, that however changed *their* condition now was from what it had been in the time of their fathers, and however far they were from having received the fulfilment of the promises then made to them as a family, the God of their fathers remained, according to his essential nature, without the least variableness or shadow of turning, of the same mind and purpose as when he first entered into covenant with them. And not only so—but in the development of this most essential and characteristic name, as there would be in their experience a glorious fulfilment of covenant love and faithfulness, so there would be a higher manifestation than had yet been given of his eternal power and Godhead, a deeper insight afforded into his blessed nature, and the righteous principles of his government; so that in comparison of what was now to be done, it might even be said, that the earlier patriarchs "had not known him by his name Jehovah," but only as "El Shaddai," God Almighty.*

With such strong encouragements and exalted prospects, was Moses sent forth to execute in the name of God the commission given to him. And as a pledge, that nothing would fail of what had been promised, he was met at the very outset of his arduous course by Aaron his brother, who came from Egypt at God's instigation to concert with him measures for the deliverance of their kindred from the now intolerable load of oppression under which they groaned.

The personal history of the deliverer and his commission, viewed in reference to the higher dispensation of the Gospel, exhibits the following principles, on which it will be unnecessary to offer any lengthened illustration. 1. The time for the deliverer appearing and entering on the mighty work given him to do, as it should be the one fittest for the purpose, so it must be the one chosen and fixed by God. It might seem long in coming to many, whose hearts groaned beneath the yoke of the adversary, and they might sometimes have been disposed, if they had been able, to hasten forward its arrival. But the Lord knew best when it should take

* Ex. vi. 3—8. In the view we have given of this passage, it is implied, that the want of knowledge ascribed to the patriarchs in respect to the name JEHOVAH, was not absolute, but relative. Literally they did know God by that name, for he frequently used it in his addresses to them, and they again in their addresses to him; —and, as men taught of God, they could not but possess some knowledge of his nature and character, as indicated by this name. But it was so imperfect and limited, that it might be represented as nothing, compared with what was presently to be given —like the glory of the Mosaic dispensation, which is declared to have been no glory "by reason of that which excelleth" in Christ—We trust it is not necessary to do more than notice, that Warburton, in the true spirit of Spencer and Le Clerc, finds in the whole of this communication about the name Jehovah, only an accommodation to Egyptian usage regarding the religion of names affirmed to have been prevalent then, "I before condescended to have a name of distinction, but now in compliance to another prejudice I condescend to have a name of honour."—(Div. Leg. B. iv. s. 6.) A notable discovery, truly! we may say in the Bishop's own language to an opponent—but certainly little fitted to throw light on the words of God, or to administer comfort to the Israelites.

place, and with unerring precision determined it beforehand. Hence we read of Christ's appearance having occurred "in due time," or, "in the fulness of time." There were many lines then meeting in the state of the church and the world, which rendered that particular period above all others suitable for the manifestation of the Son of God. Then for the first time were all things ready for the execution of Heaven's grand purpose, and the vast issues that were to grow out of it. 2. The Deliverer, when he came must arise within the church itself. He must be in the strictest sense the brother of those whom he came to redeem; bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh; partaker not merely of their nature, but also of their infirmities, their dangers, and their sufferings. Though he had to come from the highest heavens to accomplish the work, still it was not as clad with the armory, and sparkling with the glory of the upper sanctuary, that he must enter on it, but as the seed of the vanquished woman, the child of promise in the family of God, and himself having experience of the lowest depths of sorrow and abasement, which sin had brought upon them. Only, however, as of that family, not of the world at large. For the church, though ever so depressed and afflicted in her condition, cannot be indebted to the world for a deliverer; the world must be indebted to her. With her is the covenant of God; and she alone is the mother of the divine seed that overcomes the wicked one.

3. Yet the deliverance, even in its earlier stages, when existing only in the personal history of the deliverer, is not altogether independent of the world—the blessing of Israel was interwoven with acts of kindness derived from the heathen—and the child Moses, with whom their very existence as a nation and all its coming glory was bound up, owed his preservation to a member of Pharaoh's house, and in that house found a fit asylum and nursing-place. Thus the earth then "helped the woman," as it has often done since. The captain of our salvation had thus also to be helped. For, though born of the tribe of Judah, he had to seek elsewhere the safety and protection which "his own" denied him, and partly —not because absolutely necessary to verify the type, but to render its fulfilment more striking and palpable—was indebted for his preservation to that very Egypt which had sheltered the infancy of Moses. So that in the case even of the Author and Finisher of our faith, the history of redemption links itself closely with the history of the world.

4. Still, the deliverer, as to his person, his preparation, his gifts and calling, is peculiarly of God. That such a person as Moses was provided for the church in the hour of her extremity, was entirely the result of God's covenant with Abraham; and the whole circumstances connected with his preparation for the work, as well as the commission given him to undertake it, and the supernatural endowments fitting him for its execution, manifestly bespoke the special and kindly interposition of God. But the same holds true in each particular, and still more illustriously appears in Christ.

In his person pre-eminently the Father's gift—a gift of peerless value, and bestowed solely from regard to the everlasting covenant, which secured the redemption of the world; in his office as mediator called and appointed by the Father; prepared also for entering on it, first by familiar converse with the world, and then by a season of wilderness-seclusion and trial;* replenished directly from above with gifts adequate to the work, even to his being filled with the whole fulness of the Godhead:—Every thing, in short, to beget the impression, that while the church is honoured as the channel through which the Deliverer comes, yet the Deliverer himself is in all respects the peculiar gift of God, and that here especially it may be said, "of him, and through him, and to him are all things."

CHAPTER III.

THE DELIVERANCE.

We have now come to the actual accomplishment of Israel's deliverance from the house of bondage. One can easily imagine, that various methods might have been devised to bring it about. And had the Israelites been an ordinary race of men, and had the question simply been, how to get them most easily and quickly released from their state of oppression, a method would probably have been adopted very different from the one that was actually pursued. It is by viewing the matter thus, that shallow and superficial minds so often form an erroneous judgment concerning it. They see nothing peculiar in the case, and form their estimate of the whole transactions, as if only common relations were concerned, and nothing more than worldly ends were in view. Hence, because the plan from the first savoured so much of judgment—because instead of seeking to have the work accomplished in the most peaceful and conciliatory manner, the Lord rather selected a course that was likely to produce bloodshed—nay, is even represented as hardening the heart of Pharaoh, that an occasion might be found for pouring a long series of troubles and desolations on the land,—because the plan actually chosen was of such a kind, many have

* It was, doubtless, not without reason, that that season was limited to forty days, corresponding to the forty years of Moses' sojourn in the Midian desert. We do not conceive such an outside and literal correspondence to have been absolutely necessary to constitute Christ the antitype to Moses—nor was any thing similar to be found in many other cases, where the relation of type and antitype undoubtedly existed, (see Typology of Scripture, Part I. c. 4.) But it was given in this and several other cases, as in that of Christ's descent into Egypt, already noticed, to draw men's attention, as by a finger-post, to the ancient forms of truth and principle, which were re-appearing and meeting in the history of him to whom all were designed to bear witness.

not scrupled to denounce it as unworthy of God, and more befitting a cruel and malignant, than a wise and beneficent being.

Now, in rising above this false ground, and the erroneous conclusions that naturally spring from it, it is first of all to be borne in mind, that higher relations were here concerned, and more important objects at stake, than those of this world. The Israelites were the chosen people of God, standing in a covenant-relation to him, his church. However far most of them had been living beneath their obligations and their calling, they still occupied a position which was held by no other family on earth; with them was identified, in a peculiar sense, the honour of God and the cause of Heaven;—and the power that oppressed and afflicted them was trampling at every step on rights which God had conferred, and provoking the execution of a curse which he had solemnly denounced. If the cause and blessing of Heaven were bound up with the Israelites, then Pharaoh, in acting toward them as an enemy and oppressor, must of necessity have maintained the cause and become liable to the doom of Satan.

Besides, it must be carefully borne in mind, that here especially, where God had immediately to work, his dealings and dispensations were of a preparatory nature. They were planned and executed in anticipation of the grand work of redemption to be brought in by Christ, and were consequently directed in such a manner as to embody on the comparatively small scale of their earthly transactions and interests, the truths and principles which were afterwards to be developed in the affairs of a divine and everlasting kingdom.* This being the case, the deliverance of Israel from the land of Egypt must have been distinguished at least by the following features:—1. It must, in the first instance, have appeared to be a work of peculiar difficulty—requiring to be accomplished in the face of very great and powerful obstacles—rescuing the people from the strong grasp of an enemy, who, though a cruel tyrant and usurper, yet, on account of their sin, had acquired over them a lordly dominion, and by means of terror kept them subject to bondage. 2. Then, from this being the case, the deliverance must necessarily have been effected by the execution of judgment upon the adversary; so that as the work of judgment proceeded on the one hand, the work of deliverance would proceed on the other, and the freedom of the covenant people be completely achieved, only when the principalities and powers which held them in bondage were utterly spoiled and vanquished. 3. Finally, this two-fold process of salvation with destruction, must have been of a kind fitted to call forth the peculiar powers and perfections of Godhead, so that all who witnessed it, or to whom the knowledge of it should come, might be constrained to own and admire the wonder-working hand of God, and instinctively, as it were, exclaim, "Behold what God hath wrought! It is His doing, and marvellous in our eyes."—We say, all this *must* have been on the supposition of the scriptural

* Typology of Scripture, Part I. c. 3.

account of the work being taken; and excepting on that supposition we have no right to give any judgment concerning it, and if we do, we shall certainly judge amiss.

On this scriptural ground we take our stand, when proceeding to examine the affairs connected with this method of deliverance, and assert them not only to be capable of a satisfactory vindication, but to have been incapable of serving the purposes which they were designed to accomplish, if they had not been ordered substantially as they were. It is manifestly impossible that here, any more than in what afterwards befell Christ, the order of events should have been left to any lawless power, working as it pleased, but that all must have been arranged "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," and arranged precisely as they occurred. The outstretching of the divine arm to inflict the most desolating judgments on the land of Egypt, was a necessary part of the plan, and the slaying of the first-born, and the overthrow of Pharaoh and his host. But since these appear as the result of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, this also must have entered as an essential element into the divine plan; and was therefore announced to Moses from the first as an event which might certainly be expected, and which would give a peculiar direction to the whole series of transactions.* For this hardening of the heart of Pharaoh was the very hinge, in a sense, on which the divine plan turned, and could least of all be left to chance or uncertainty. It presents itself, not simply as an obstacle to be removed, but as a circumstance to be employed for securing a more illustrious display of the glorious attributes of God, and effecting the redemption of his people in the way most consistent with his righteous purposes. It could not, therefore, be allowed to hang merely upon the will of Pharaoh; somehow the hand of God *must* have been in the matter, as it belongs to him to settle and arrange all that concerns the redemption of his people, and the manifestation of his own glory. Nor, otherwise, could there have been any security for the divine plan proceeding to its accomplishment, or for its possessing such features as might render it a fitting preparation for the greater redemption that was to come.

It seems to us impossible to look at the hardening of Pharaoh's heart in the connexion which it thus holds with the entire plan of God, or to consider the marked and distinct manner in which it is ascribed to his agency, and yet to speak of Pharaoh being simply allowed to harden his own heart, as presenting a sufficient explanation of the case. It is true, he is often affirmed also to have himself hardened his heart; and in the very first announcement of it, (ch. iii. 19, "I am sure, or rather, I know that the king of Egypt will not let you go,") as acutely remarked by Baumgarten, "the Lord characterizes the resistance of Pharaoh as an act of freedom, existing apart from the Lord himself; for I *know* that which objectively stands out and apart from me."† At the same time it is

* Ex. iii. 19, iv. 21.

† Commentary on Ex. iii. 19, 20.

justly noticed by Hengstenberg, that the hardening being ascribed to God, both in the announcement of it beforehand, and in the subsequent recapitulation, (Ex. iv. 21, vii. 3, xi. 10,) "Pharaoh's hardening appears to be enclosed within that of God's, and to be dependent on it. It seems also to be intentional, that the hardening is chiefly ascribed to Pharaoh at the beginning of the plagues, and to God toward the end. The higher the plagues rise, the more does Pharaoh's hardening assume a supernatural character, and the reference was the more likely to be made to its supernatural cause."*

The conclusion, indeed, is inevitable. It is impossible, by any fair interpretation of scripture, or on any profound view of the transactions referred to, to get rid of the divine agency in the matter. Even Tholuck says, "That the hardening of the Egyptian was, on one side, ordained by God, no disciple of Christian theology can deny. It is an essential doctrine of the Bible, that God would not permit evil, unless he were Lord over it; and that he permits it, because it cannot act as a check upon his plan of the world, but must be equally subservient to him as good—the only difference being, that the former is so compulsorily, the latter optionally."† That God has no hand in the sin, which mingles itself with evil, is clearly implied in the general doctrine of Scripture; since he every where appears there as the avenger of sin, and hence cannot possibly be in any sense its author. In so far, therefore, as the hardening of Pharaoh's heart partook of sin, it must have been altogether his own; his conduct, considered as a course of heady and high-minded opposition to the divine will, was pursued in the free, though unrighteous exercise of his own judgment. But still this does not hinder that there should have been a direct and positive agency of God in the matter, to the effect of determining both the manner and extent of the opposition. "It is in the power of the wicked to sin," says St. Augustine, "but that in sinning they do this or that by their wickedness, is not in their own power but in God's, who divides and arranges the darkness."‡ To the same purpose, and still more distinctly, the Westminster Confession of Faith; "God's providence extendeth itself to all sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing them, in a manifold dispensation, unto his

* Authentie, ii. p. 462. Some stress is laid by Hengstenberg on the hardening being ascribed *seven* times to Pharaoh, and the same number of times to God, as indicating that it has respect to the covenant of God, of which seven is the sign. Baumgarten also lays some stress on the numbers, but finds each to be *ten* times repeated, the sign of completeness. Both have to deal arbitrarily with the sacred text to make out their respective numbers, (for example, Hengstenberg leaves out the three hardenings of God in ch. xiv. and Baumgarten treats ch. vii. 13 and 14, as if they spoke of two distinct hardenings,) and it is against the simplicity of Scripture narrative to draw from the mere form of its statements such hidden meanings.

† On Rom. ix. 19, note furnished to English translation, Bib. Cab. xii. p. 249. Bush, however, in his notes on Exodus, still speaks of the mere permission as sufficient; "God is said to have done it, because he permitted it to be done." His criticism on the words does not in the least contribute to help this meaning. Dean Graves, as Arminian writers generally, holds the same view. (Works, Vol. III. p. 321, &c.)

‡ Liber, de Prædestinatione Sanctorum, § 33.

own holy ends; yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature and not from God." It is wholly chargeable on man himself, if there is a sinful disposition at work in his bosom; but that disposition existing there, and resisting the means which God employs to subdue it, the man has no longer any control over the course and issue of events. This is entirely in the hands of God, to be directed by him in the way, and turned into the form and channel which is best adapted to promote the ends of his righteous government. "He places the sinner in such situations, that precisely this or that temptation shall assail him—links the thoughts to certain determinate objects of sinful desire, and secures their remaining attached to these, and not starting off to others. The hatred in the heart belonged to Shimei himself; but it was God's work that this hatred should settle so peculiarly upon David, and should show itself in exactly the manner it did. It was David's own fault that he became elated with pride; the course of action which this pride was to take was accidental, so far as he was concerned; it belonged to God, who turns the hearts of kings, like the rivers of waters. Hence it is said, 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, 'The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.' Yet was he not thereby in the least justified, and therefore, v. 10, he confesses, that he had sinned greatly, and prays the Lord to take away his iniquity."*

Now, applying these views to the case of Pharaoh, it was certainly his own proud and wicked heart which prompted him to refuse the command of God to let Israel go; but he might have retained that disposition in all its force, and yet have acted differently from what he did. Mere selfishness, or considerations of policy, might have induced him to restrain it, as from like motives, not from any proper change of heart, his magicians first, and afterwards his counsellors, appear to have wished. (Ex. viii. 19; x. 7.) But the hand of God exerted such control over him, so bounded and hedged him in, that while he clung to the evil principle, he must pursue his infatuated and fool-hardy course; this one path lay open to him. And for his doing so, two things were necessary, and in these the action of Omnipotence discovers itself:—1. First, the strong and courageous disposition capable of standing fast under formidable dangers, and grappling with gigantic difficulties—a natural endowment, which could only have been derived from God. That such a disposition should have been possessed in so eminent a degree by the Pharaoh who then occupied the throne of Egypt, was the result of God's agency, though Pharaoh alone was responsible for its abuse. 2. But, besides, there was needed such a disposal of circumstances as might tend to prompt and stimulate to the utmost this disposition of Pharaoh; for otherwise it might have lain comparatively

* Authentie, II. p. 466. See also Calvin's Institutes, B. I. c. 18, and B. II. c. 4, for the proof, rather than the explanation, of the fact, that "bare permission is too weak to stand, and that it is the merest trifling to substitute a bare permission for the providence of God, as if he sat in a watch-tower, waiting for fortuitous events, his judgments meanwhile depending on the will of man."

dormant, or, at least, might have been far from running such a singularly perverse and infatuated course. Here also the hand of God manifested its working. It was he who, in the language of Tholuck, "brought about those circumstances, which made the heart disposed to evil still harder." Many writers, who substantially admit this, limit the circumstances tending to produce the result in question to the lenity and forbearance of God, in so readily and frequently releasing Pharaoh from the execution of judgment. There can be no doubt, that this was one of the circumstances which, on such a mind as his, would be fitted to produce a hardening effect; but it was not the only, nor the chief one; there were others, which must have had a still more powerful tendency in the same direction, and which were also more properly judicial in their character. Such, in the first instance, and most evidently, was the particular kinds of miracles which Moses was instructed to work at the commencement of his operations—the transforming of his rod into a serpent, and back again to a rod; for this was precisely the field on which Pharaoh might be tempted to think he could successfully compete with Moses, and might rival, at least, if not outdo, the pretended messengers of Heaven. However inexplicable the fact may be, of the fact itself there can be no question, that, from time immemorial the art of working extraordinary, and to all appearance supernatural effects on serpents, has been practised by a particular class of persons in Egypt. Many of the ancients have written of the wonderful exploits of the Psylli, as they are called, and celebrated their magical power, both to charm serpents at their will, and to resist unharmed the bites of the most venomous species. And it would seem, by the accounts of recent inquirers, that descendants of the ancient brotherhood still exist in Egypt, forming an association by themselves, and able, by some means unknown to any but themselves, to handle without fear or injury the most noxious serpents, to walk abroad with numbers of them coiling around their necks and arms, and to make certainly one species of them rigid like a rod, and feign themselves dead.* It is also certain, that when they do these wonders, they are in a sort of phrensied or ecstatical condition, and are believed by the multitude to be under divine influence. That this charming influence was, at least, in its origin and earlier stages the offspring to some extent of demoniacal power, is not inconsistent with what Scripture testifies concerning the workings of that power generally, and is most naturally implied in the particular statements made respecting the magicians when contending with Moses. For although we might without much violence to the interpretation of the text, suppose it to represent that as being done, which to all appearance was done, without being understood positively to affirm that the effect was

* See the quotations from the ancients in Bochart, Hieroz. ii. p. 393 and 4; and for the accounts of the moderns, Hengstenberg's Egypt and books of Moses, p. 98–103. Among these are the testimonies of the French savants, who were quite incredulous before they investigated the affair, as to there being any thing more than common sleight-of-hand in it, but who were obliged to confess that "they saw things so wonderful that they could no longer consider the art as entirely chimerical."

actually produced; yet the language used of their changing the rods into serpents, and on a small scale also turning water into blood, and producing frogs, does in its proper import indicate something supernatural—corresponding, as we conceive, to the wonders of the demoniacal possessions of our Lord's time, and still more closely perhaps to "the working of Satan with all power, and signs and lying wonders," which is made to characterize the coming of Antichrist (Matt. xxiv. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xiii. 13.) But even without pressing this, the mere fact of there being then a class of persons in the service of Pharaoh, who themselves pretended, and were generally believed to be possessed of a divine power to work the wonders in question, must evidently have acted as a temptation with Pharaoh to resist the demands of Moses, being confident of his ability to contend with him on this peculiar field of prodigies. And having fairly ventured on the field of conflict, we can easily understand how, with a proud and Heaven-defying temper like his, he would scorn to own himself vanquished; even though the miraculous working of Moses clearly established its superiority to any act or power possessed by the magicians, and they themselves were at last compelled to retire from the field, owning the victory to be Jehovah's.

This, however, was only one class of the circumstances which were arranged by God, and fitted to harden the heart of Pharaoh. To the same account we must also place the progressive nature of the demands made upon him, in beginning first with a request for leave of three days' absence to worship God; then, when this was granted for all who were properly capable of taking part in the service, insisting on the same liberty being extended to the wives and children; and, again, when even this was conceded, claiming to take with them also their flocks and herds: so that it was at last evident an entire escape from the land was meditated. There was no deceit, as the adversaries of revelation have sometimes alleged, in this gradual opening of the divine plan; nor, when the last and largest demand was made, was more asked than Pharaoh should from the first have voluntarily granted. But so little was sought at the beginning, to make the unreasonableness of his conduct more distinctly apparent, and the gradual and successive enlargement of the demand was intended to act as a temptation, to prove him, and bring out the real temper of his heart. Finally, of the same character also was the last movement of Heaven in this marvellous chain of providences—the leading of the children of Israel, as into a net, between the Red Sea and the mountains of the wilderness, fitted, as it so manifestly was, to suggest the thought to Pharaoh, when he had recovered a little from his consternation, and felt the humiliation of his defeat, that now an opportunity presented itself of retrieving his lost honour, and with one stroke avenging himself of his enemies. He was thus tempted, in the confidence of victory, to renew the conflict, and when apparently sure of his prey, was led, by the opening of the sea for the escape of the Israelites, and the removal of the divine cloud to the rear, so as to

cover their flight, into the fatal snare which involved him in destruction. In the whole, we see the directing and controlling agency of God, not in the least interfering with the liberty of Pharaoh, or obliging him to sin, but still, in judgment for his sinful oppression of the Church of God, and unjust resistance to the claims of Heaven, placing him in situations which, though fitted to influence aright a well constituted mind, were also fitted, when working on such a temperament as his, to shut him up to the extraordinary course he took, and to render the series of transactions, as they actually occurred, a matter of moral certainty.*

But to return to the wonders which Moses was commissioned to perform, it is to be borne in mind, that the humiliation of Pharaoh was not their only design, nor even the redemption of Israel their sole end. The manifestation of God's own glory was here, as in all his works, the highest object in view; and this required that the powers of Egyptian idolatry, with which the interest of Satan was at that time peculiarly identified, should be brought into the conflict, and manifestly confounded. For this reason, also, it was that the first wonders wrought had such distinct reference to the exploits of the magicians or serpent-charmers, who were the wonder-workers connected with that gigantic system of idolatry, and the main instruments of its support and credit in the world. They were thus naturally drawn, as well as Pharaoh, into the contest, and became, along with him, the visible heads and representatives of the "spiritual wickedness" of Egypt. And since they refused to own the supremacy, and accede to the demands of Jehovah, on witnessing that first, and as it may be called, harmless triumph of his power over theirs—since they resolved, as the adversaries of God's and the instruments of Satan's interest, in the world, to prolong the contest, there remained no alternative but to visit the land with a series of judgments, such as might clearly prove the utter impotence of its fancied deities to protect their votaries from the might and vengeance of the living God. It is when considered in this point of view, that we see the agreement in principle between the wonders proceeding from the instrumentality of Moses, and those wrought by the hand of Christ. They seem at first sight to be entirely opposite in their character, the one being severe and desolating plagues, the other, miracles of mercy and healing. This seeming contrariety arises from their having been wrought on entirely different fields—those of Moses on an avowedly hostile territory, those of Christ on a land and among a people that were peculiarly his own. But as in both cases alike there was a mighty

* We have spoken of Pharaoh himself having perished in the overthrow at the Red Sea; and such seems the natural import of Scripture on the subject, although it is not expressly asserted. Wilkinson thinks the escape of Israel was made in the fourth year of Thothmes III. who reigned in all 39 years. If so, of course he was not personally drowned; but we question whether the interpretation of the hieroglyphics is yet far enough advanced to admit of such definite information being drawn from them in regard to so remote a period. That learned and accomplished individual himself, so far from speaking dogmatically on the subject, gives Lord Prudhoe's reasons for assigning a considerably later period, and leaves the decision to the learned, as a point regarding which absolute certainty is not attainable.

adversary, whose power and dominion were to be brought down, so the display given, in each, of miraculous working, told with the same effect on his interest, though somewhat less conspicuously in the one case than in the other. While Christ's works were, in the highest sense, miracles of mercy, supernatural acts of beneficence towards "his own," they were, at the same time, triumphant displays of Divine over Satanic agency. "The Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil;" as often as his hand was stretched out to heal, it dealt a blow to the cause of the adversary; and the crowning part of the Redeemer's work on earth, his dying the accursed death of the cross, was that which at once perfected the plan of mercy for the faithful, and judged and spoiled the prince of darkness. In like manner, we see mercy and judgment going hand in hand in the wonders that were done by the instrumentality of Moses on the "field of Zoan"—only from that being the field of the adversary, and the wonders being done directly upon him, the judgment stands forth more prominently to view. It was essentially a religious contest between the God of heaven on the one side, and the powers of Egyptian idolatry on the other, as represented by Pharaoh and his host; and as one stroke after another was inflicted by the arm of Omnipotence, there was discovered the nothingness of the divinities whose cause Pharaoh maintained, and in whose power he trusted, while "the God of Israel triumphed gloriously, and in mercy led forth the people whom he had redeemed, to his holy habitation."

It is not necessary that we should show, by a minute examination of each of the plagues, how excellently they were fitted to expose the futility of Egyptian idolatry, and to show how entirely every thing there was at the disposal of the God of Israel, whether for good or evil. The total number of the plagues was ten, indicating their completeness for the purposes intended by their infliction. The first nine were but preparatory, like the miraculous works which Christ performed during his active ministry; the last was the great act of judgment, which was to carry with it the complete prostration of the adversary, and the deliverance of the covenant people. It was, therefore, from the first announced, as the grand means to be employed for the accomplishment of Israel's redemption (Ex. iv. 22, 23.) But the preceding miracles were by no means unnecessary, as they tended to disclose the absolute sovereignty of Jehovah over the whole province of nature, as well as over the lives of men (which came out in the last plague,) and his power to turn whatever was known of natural good in Egypt into an instrument of evil, and to aggravate the evil into tenfold severity. This was manifestly the general design; and it is not necessary to prove, either that these plagues were quite different in their nature from any thing commonly known in Egypt, or that each one of them struck upon some precise feature of the existing idolatry. In reference to the first of these points, we by no means think, with Hengstenberg, that in the natural phenomena of Egypt there was a corresponding evil to each one of the plagues, and that

the plague only consisted in the supernatural degree to which the common evil was carried; nor can any proof be adduced in support of this, at all satisfactory. But as the evil principle (Typhon) was worshipped in Egypt, not less than the good, and worshipped, doubtless, because of his supposed power over the hurtful influences of nature,* we might certainly expect that *some*, at least, of the plagues, would appear to be only an aggravation of the natural evils to which that land was peculiarly exposed; so that these, as well as its genial and beneficent properties, might be seen to be under the control of Jehovah. Of this kind unquestionably was the third plague, (that of lice, or, as is now generally agreed, of the gnats, with which Egypt peculiarly abounds, and which all travellers, from Herodotus to those of the present day, concur in representing as a source of great trouble and annoyance in that country.†) Of the same kind, also, was the plague of flies, which swarm in Egypt, of all sorts, and that also of the locusts;‡ to which we may add the plague of boils, which Scripture itself mentions as of frequent occurrence in Egypt (Deut. xxviii. 27.) But while we can easily account for the production on a gigantic scale of these natural evils, the same object, viz. the executing of judgment upon the gods of Egypt, would also lead us to expect other plagues of an entirely different kind, in which the natural good was restrained and even converted into a source of evil. For in this way alone could confusion be poured upon the worship of the good principle, and which, there as elsewhere, took the form of a deification of the genial and productive powers of nature. Some of these belonged to Egypt in a quite extraordinary degree, and were regarded as constituting its peculiar glory. Such especially was the Nile, which was looked upon as identical with Osiris, the highest god, and to which Pharaoh himself is evidently represented as paying divine honours, in Ex. vii. 15; viii. 20.§ Such, also, are its almost cloudless sky and ever-brilliant sun, rendering the climate so singularly clear and settled, that a shade is seldom to be seen; and not only the more violent tempests, but even the gentlest showers of rain are a rarity. Hence, of the earlier plagues, the first two—those of the turning of the water into blood, and the frogs—took the form of a judgment upon the Nile, converting it from being the most beneficial and delightful, into the most noxious and loathsome of terrestrial objects; while in the later plagues, of the tempest and the thick darkness, the Egyptians saw their crystal atmosphere and resplendent heavens suddenly compelled to wear an aspect of indescribable terror and appalling gloom. So that whether nature were worshipped there, in respect to her benignant, or her hurtful influences, the plagues actually inflicted were equally adapted to

* Plutarch, de Iside et Osiride, p. 362, 380. See also the note of Mosheim to Cudworth's Intellectual System, vol. i. p. 353. Tegg's edition, and Bochart, Hieroz. Lib. ii. c. 34.

† See the note in the Pictorial Bible on Ex. viii. 17. Also Hengstenberg's Eg. and Books of Moses, for quotations from various authorities. ‡ Ibid.

§ Hengstenberg, p. 109, where see the authorities referred to. Also Vossius, de Origine et Prog. Idolatriæ, L. ii. c. 74, 75.

confound the gods of Egypt—in the one case by changing the natural good into its opposite evil, and in the other by imparting to the natural evil a supernatural force and intensity.*

Taking this general and comprehensive view of the preliminary plagues, it will easily be seen that there is no need for our seeking to find in each of them a special reference to some individual feature of Egyptian idolatry. If they struck at the root of that system in what might be called its leading principles, there was manifestly no necessity for dealing a separate and successive blow against its manifold shades and peculiarities of false worship. For this an immensely greater number than nine or ten would have been required. And as it is, in attempting to connect even these ten with the minutiæ of Egyptian idolatry, much that is fanciful and arbitrary must be resorted to. So long as we keep to the general features and design, the bearing of the wonders wrought can be made plain enough; but those who would lead us more into detail, take for granted what is not certain, and sometimes even affirm what is manifestly absurd. To say, for example, that the plague of flies had any peculiar reference to the worship of Baal-zebub, the Fly-god, assumes a god to have been worshipped there, who is not known to have been so. It is equally arbitrary to connect the plague of locusts with the worship of Serapis. And it is surely to draw pretty largely on one's credulity, to speak of the miracle on the serpents as intended to destroy these, on account of their being the objects of worship,—or to set forth the plague on cattle as aimed at the destruction of the entire system of brute worship, as if no cattle were killed in Egypt, because the Deity was there worshipped under that symbol!† The general argument is weakened

* We are surprised that Hengstenberg did not see the necessity of the one class of wonders, as well as of the other, for the object in view. He has hence laboured to find a corresponding natural evil to *all* the plagues, and in some of the cases has most palpably laboured in vain. He is at pains to prove, that the Nile, when swollen, has somewhat of a reddish colour, and that it is not without frogs—the wonder, indeed, would be, if it were otherwise in either respect—but he has not produced even the shadow of proof, that these things belonged to it to such an extent as to render it nauseous or unwholesome, or so much as to suggest the idea of a plague. On the contrary, the redness of the water is rather a sign of its becoming again fit for use. (See Pictorial Bible on Ex. vii. 17.) Then, a great array of authorities is produced (p. 117) to show, that it has sometimes been known to thunder, and does occasionally rain in Egypt. The proof only amounts to this, that the elements there are capable of assuming such appearances, and in some very partial and trifling instances actually do so. But no one would surely ever think from that of representing them as natural evils existing there—and short of that, any proof is beside the purpose. The authorities he refers to on the subject of the darkness and the slaying of the first-born, are scarcely less unsatisfactory.

† The contrary needs no proof, as every one knows, who is in the least acquainted with ancient Egypt, that "oxen generally were used both for food and sacrifice," (Heeren, Af. ii. p. 147,) and evidence has even been found among the ancient documents, of a company of curriers, or leather-dressers, (Ib. p. 137.) It is not less absurd to represent the plague of lice or gnats as done on purpose to afflict Egyptian idolatry, which permitted no priest to enter a temple with these creatures on him. There was not much less care to keep the person clean in the Jewish than in the Egyptian religion, and the plague might as well be said to reflect in that respect on the Jewish, as the Egyptian rites. Bryant, in his book on the plagues, led the way to these weak and frivolous opinions, and he has been followed by many without examination. See, for example, the Philosophy of Plan of Salvation, chapter iii.

by being coupled with such puerilities, as the grand impression, also, which the wonders were designed to produce, would have been frittered down and impaired, rather than deepened, by so many allusions to the inferior parts of the system.

But now, when God had by the first nine plagues vindicated his power over all that was naturally good or evil in Egypt, and had thus smitten with judgment their nature-worship, in both of its grand characteristics, the adversary being still determined to maintain his opposition, it was time to inflict that last and greatest judgment, the execution of which was from the first designed to be the death-blow of the adversary, and the signal of Israel's deliverance. This was the slaying of the first-born, in which the Lord manifested his dominion over the highest region of life. Indeed, in this respect, there is clearly discernible, as was already noticed by Aben-ezra and other Jewish writers,* a gradual ascent in the plagues from the lower to the higher provinces of nature, which also tends to confirm the view we have presented of their character and design. The first two come from beneath—from the waters, which may be said to be under the earth; the next two from the ground or surface of the earth; the murrain of beasts and the boils on men belong to the lower atmosphere, as the tempest, the showers of locusts, and the darkness, to the higher; so that one only remains, that which is occupied by the life of man, and which stands in immediate connexion with the divine power and glory. And, as in the earlier plagues, God separated between the land of Goshen and the rest of Egypt, to show that he was not only the Supreme Jehovah, but also the covenant God of Israel, so in this last and crowning act of judgment, it was especially necessary, that while the stroke of death fell upon every dwelling of Egypt, the habitations of Israel should be preserved in perfect peace and safety.—But two questions naturally arise here: why in this judgment upon the life of man, should precisely the first-born have been slain—and if the judgment was for the overthrow of the adversary and the redemption of Israel, why should a special provision have been required to save Israel also from the plague?

1. In regard to the first of these points, there can be no doubt, that the slaying of the first-born of Egypt had respect to the relation of Israel to Jehovah: "Israel," said God, "is my son, my first-born—if thou refuse to let him go, I will slay thy son, thy first-born," (Ex. iv. 20–22.) But in what sense could Israel be called God's first-born son? Something more is plainly indicated by the expression, though no more is very commonly found in it, than that Israel was peculiarly dear to God, had a sort of first-born's interest in his regard. It implies this, no doubt, but it also goes deeper, and points to the divine origin of Israel as the seed of promise—in their birth the offspring of grace, as contradistinguished from nature. Such pre-eminently was Isaac, the first-born of the family, the type of all that was to follow; and such now were the

* See in Baumgarten's Commentary, i. p. 459.

whole family, when grown into a people, as contradistinguished from the other nations of the earth. They were not the whole that were to occupy this high and distinctive relation; they were but the beginning of the holy seed—the first-born of Jehovah—the first-fruits of a redeemed world, which in the fulness was to comprehend "all kindreds, peoples, and tongues." Hence the promise to Abraham was, that he should be the father, not of one, but "of many nations." But these first-fruits represent the whole, and, themselves alone existing as yet, might now be said to comprehend the whole. If they were to be destroyed, the rest cannot come into existence—for a redeemed Israel was the only seed-corn of a redeemed world—but if they should be saved, their salvation would be the pledge and type of the salvation of all. And, therefore, to make it clearly manifest, that God was here acting upon the principle, which connects the first-fruits with the whole lump, acting not for that one family merely, and that moment of time then present, but for his people of every kindred and of every age, he takes that principle for the very ground of his great judgment on the enemy, and the redemption thence accruing to his people. As the first-born in God's elect family is to be spared and rescued, so the first-born in the house of the enemy, the beginning of his increase, and the heir of his substance, must be destroyed—the one a proof that the whole family were appointed to life and blessing, the other, in like manner, a proof that all who were aliens from God's covenant of grace, equally deserved and should certainly in due time inherit, the evils of perdition.

2. In regard to the other question, which concerns Israel's liability to the judgment which fell upon Egypt, this arose from Israel's natural relation to the world, just as their redemption was secured by their spiritual relation to God. For, whether viewed in their individual or in their collective capacity, they were in themselves of Egypt—collectively, a part of the nation, still without a separate and independent existence of their own, vassals of the enemy, and inhabitants of his doomed territory—individually, also, partakers of the guilt and corruption of Egypt. It is the mercy and grace alone of God's covenant, which makes them to differ from those around them; and therefore, to show, that while from being interested in this, the plague should not come nigh them, nor a hair of their head perish, they still were in themselves no better than others, and had nothing whereof to boast, it was provided that their exemption from judgment should be secured only by the blood of atonement. This blood of the Lamb; slain and sprinkled upon their door-posts was the sign between them and God—the sign, on his part, that according to the purport of his covenant, he accepted a ransom in their behalf, in respect to which he would spare them, "as a man spareth his son;"—and the sign, on their part, that they owned the God of Abraham as their God, and claimed a share in the privileges which He so freely vouchsafed to them. Thus, in their case, "mercy rejoiced against judgment,"—yet, so as clearly to manifest, that had they been dealt with on the score of merit,

and with respect merely to what they were in themselves, they too must have perished under the rebuke of Heaven.

It was in consideration of the perfectly gratuitous nature of this salvation, and to give due prominence and perpetuity to the principle on which the judgment and the mercy alike proceeded, that the Lord now claimed the first-born of Israel as peculiarly his own. (Ex. xiii.) The Israelites in their collective capacity were his first-born, and as such were saved from death, the just desert and doom of sin which others inherited; but within that election there was henceforth to be another election—a first-born among these first-born, who, as having been the immediate subjects of the divine deliverance, were to be peculiarly devoted to him. They were to be set apart, or literally, "to be made to pass over to God," (Ex. xiii. 12,) leaving what might be called the more common ground of duty and service, and connecting themselves with that which belonged exclusively to himself. It implied, that they had in a sense derived a new life from God—lived out of death, and, consequently, were bound to show that they did so, by living in a new manner, in a course of holy consecration to the Lord. This was strikingly taught in the ordinance regarding the first-born of cattle and beasts, of which the clean were to be presented as an offering to the Lord, that is, wholly given up to him by death (Ex. xxii. 29, 30; xxxiv. 19, 20,) while in the case of the unclean, such as the ass, a lamb was to be sacrificed in its stead. The meaning evidently was, that the kind of consecration to himself which the Lord sought from the first-born, as it sprung from an act of redemption, saving them from guilt and death, so it was to be made good by a separation, on the one hand, from what was morally unclean, and, on the other, by a self-dedication to all holy and spiritual services. But then, as the redemption in which they had primarily participated was accorded to them in their character as the first-fruits, the representatives of their respective households, and all the households equally shared with them in the deliverance achieved, so it was manifestly the mind of God, that their state and calling should be regarded as substantially belonging to all, and that in them were only to be seen the more eminent and distinguished examples of what should characterize the whole body. Hence the people were in one mass presently addressed as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," (Ex. xix. 6)—called to be universally what the first-born were called to be pre-eminently and peculiarly. In short, as these first-born had been as to their redemption in a manner the proxies of the whole, so were they in their subsequent consecration to be the symbolical lights and patterns of the whole. Nor was any change in this respect made by the substitution of the tribe of Levi in their room (Num. iii. 12.) For this, as will appear in its proper place, was only the supplanting of a less by a more perfect arrangement, which was also done in such a way as to render most distinctly manifest the representative character of the tribe, which entered into the place of the first-born;—so that we see here, at the very outset, what was God's aim in the redemption of

his people, and how it involved, not simply their release from the thraldom and the oppression of Egypt, but also their standing in a peculiar relation to himself, and their call to show forth his glory. We perceive in this act of redemption the kernel of all that was afterwards developed, as to duty and privilege, by the revelations of law and the institutions of worship. And we see also what a depth of meaning there is in the expression used in Heb. xiii. 23, where it is represented as the ennobling distinction of Christians, that they have "come to the church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven." To designate the church as that of the first-born, is to present it to our view in its highest character—in its state of most blessed nearness to God, of peculiar interest in his favour, and singular destination to advance his kingdom and glory. United to such a company, we are in a manner, told, nothing shall be wanting that is needed to secure our well-being; redemption is ours, with its sure deliverance from evil, and its glorious issues of life and blessing; the destroyer cannot hurt us, for we dwell beneath the shade of the Almighty,—the heirs of his fulness, enrolled members of his everlasting kingdom, and children ransomed from the yoke of servitude, to live henceforth to his glory, and minister and serve before him.*

When we come to consider the commemorative institution of the Passover, we shall see how admirably its services were adapted to bring out and embody to the eye of the church the great principles of truth and duty, which were entwined with the grand providence of God we have now been reviewing. But before we leave the consideration of it as an act of providence, there is another point connected with it, at which we would briefly glance, and one in which the Egyptians and Israelites were both concerned. We refer to what has been not less unscripturally than unhappily called, "the borrowing of jewels" from the Egyptians by the Israelites on the eve of their departure.† That the sacred text in the ori-

* It is singular how entirely commentators generally have missed the proper force of this passage in Hebrews. The first-born to which Christians are come, says Whitby, are the apostles, who have received the first fruits of the Spirit. The apostles were themselves a part of the New Testament church, of whom the declaration was made; and the explanation amounts simply to this:—Ye who have the first fruits of the Spirit are come to those who have the first fruits of the Spirit! Macknight is no better:—"The first-born of man and beast being reckoned more excellent than the subsequent births, were appropriated to God. Hence the Israelites had the name of God's *first-born* given them, to show that they belonged to God, and were more excellent than the rest of the nations." Is that all? Is it on *such* a distinction that God made the church's redemption and the Christian's hopes to turn?

† The sense of *borrowing* was, by a mistranslation of the Septuagint on ch. xii. 36, first given to the Hebrew word. This misled the fathers, who were generally acquainted with Hebrew, and even Jerome adopted that meaning, though possessed of learning sufficient to detect the error. The Hebrew word is שאל, which simply means to ask or demand: "Speak now to the ears of the people, and let every man ask of his neighbour jewels (rather, articles) of gold," &c. (ch. xi. 1—3.) It is the same word that is used in xii. 36, and which has there so commonly obtained the sense of *lending*. Here it is in the Hiphill or cause-form, and strictly means, "to cause another to ask." Rendered literally, the first part of the verse would stand, "And the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians, and they made them to ask or desire." This can only mean, that the Lord produced such an impression upon the minds of the Egyptians in favour of the Israelites, that, so far from needing

ginal gives no countenance to this false view of the transaction, we have explained in the note below; and, indeed, the whole circumstances of the case render it quite incredible that there should have been a borrowing and lending in the proper sense of the terms. It is not conceivable that now, when Moses had refused to move, unless they were allowed to take with them all their flocks and herds, any thought should have been entertained of their return. Nor could this, at such a time, have been wished by any; for after the land had been smitten by so many plagues on account of them, and when, especially by the last awful judgment every heart was paralyzed with fear and trembling, the desire of the Egyptians must have run entirely in the opposite direction. Such we are expressly told was the case, for "the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men." Besides, what possible use could they have had for articles of gold, silver, and apparel, if they were only to be absent for a few days? The very request must have betrayed the intention, and the utmost credulity on the part of the Egyptians could not have induced them to give on such a supposition. It is farther evident, that this must have been the general understanding in Egypt, from the numbers, "the mixed multitude," as they are called, who went along with the Israelites, and who must have gone with them under the impression, that the Israelites were taking a final leave of Egypt. Hence the reasoning of Calvin and other commentators, who, under the idea of its being a proper borrowing and lending, endeavour to justify the transaction by resting on the absolute authority of God, who has a right to command what he pleases, falls of itself to the ground; nor even as a piece of reasoning does it fairly meet the point at issue; for the unchangeably righteous God could never enjoin upon his creatures as a duty, what, as practised between man and man, would involve a manifest dishonesty or injustice.

Now, that this giving on the part of the Egyptians, and receiving on the part of the Israelites, was intimately connected with God's great work of judgment on the one, and mercy to the other, is manifest from the place it holds in the Divine record. It was already foretold to Abraham, that his posterity should come forth from the land of their oppression with much substance. That the prediction should be fulfilled in this particular way, was declared to Moses in God's first interview with him, (Ex. iii. 21, 22.) And both then, and immediately before it took place, as also when it did take place, the Lord constantly spoke of it as his own doing, the fruitful result of his outstretched arm upon the Egyptians. We can never imagine, that so much account would have been made of it, if the whole end to be served, had simply been to provide the Israelites with a certain supply of goods and apparel. A much higher object was unquestionably aimed at. As regards the

to be cozened, or constrained to part with the articles of gold, silver, and apparel, they rather invited the Israelites to ask them: take what you will, we are willing to give all.

Egyptians, it was a part of the judgment which God was now visiting upon them for their past misdeeds, and which here, as not unfrequently happened, was made to take a form analogous to the sin it was designed to chastise. Thus, in another age, when the Israelites themselves became the objects of chastisement, they said, "We will flee upon horses; therefore, (said God,) ye shall flee, and they that pursue you shall be swift," (Isa. xxx. 16.) And again, in Jeremiah, "Like as ye have forsaken me, and served strange gods in your land, so shall ye serve strangers in a land that is not yours," (ch. v. 19.) So here, the Egyptians had been long acting the part of oppressors of God's people, seeking, by the most harsh and tyrannical measures, to weaken and impoverish them. And now, when God comes down to avenge their cause, he constrains Egypt to furnish them with a rich supply of her treasures and goods. No art or violence was needed on their part to accomplish this; the thing was in a manner done to their hand. The enemies themselves become at last so awed and moved by the strong hand of God upon them, that they would do any thing to hasten forward his purpose. Their proud and stubborn hearts bow beneath his arm, like tender willows before the blast; and they feel impelled by an irresistible power to send forth, with honour and great substance, the very people they had so long been unjustly trampling under foot. What a triumphant display of the sovereign might and dominion of God over the adversaries of his church! What a striking manifestation of the truth, that He can not only turn their counsels into foolishness, but also render them unconscious instruments of promoting his cause and glory in the world! And what a convincing proof of the folly of those who would enrich or benefit themselves at the expense of God's interest; and not less so of the infallible certainty with which his faithful people may expect whatever they absolutely require from an adverse world!

Throughout the discussion pursued in this chapter we have so intermingled the present with the prospective or typical bearings of the transactions referred to, that no separate enunciation of the latter can now be required. And the less so, as a considerable portion of them will again present themselves to our notice, when we come to examine the institution of the passover.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MARCH THROUGH THE WILDERNESS—MANNA—WATER FROM THE ROCK—THE PILLAR OF CLOUD AND FIRE.

The children of Israel are now in the condition of a ransomed people, delivered from the yoke of the oppressor, and personally in a state of freedom and enlargement. They have been redeemed for the inheritance, but still the inheritance is not theirs; they are

separated from it by a great and terrible wilderness, where many trials and difficulties must certainly be encountered, and nature, if left to itself, will inevitably perish. They were not long in feeling this. To the outward eye, the prospect, which lay immediately before them, when they marched from the shores of the Red Sea, was peculiarly dark and disheartening. The country they had left behind, with all the hardships and oppressions it had latterly contained for them, was still a rich and cultivated region. It presented to the eye luxuriant fields, and teemed with the best of Nature's productions; they had there the most delicious water to drink, and were fed with flesh and bread to the full. But *now*—even now, after the most extraordinary wonders had been wrought in their behalf, and the power that oppressed them had been laid low—every thing assumes the most dismal and discouraging aspect; nothing to be seen but a boundless waste of burning sand and lifeless stones; and a tedious march before them, through trackless and inhospitable deserts, where it seemed impossible to find for such an immense host even the commonest necessaries of life. What advantage was it to them in such a case to have been brought out with a high hand from the house of bondage? They had escaped, indeed, from the yoke of the oppressor, but only to be placed in circumstances more vexing to nature, and exposed to more appalling calamities. And as death seemed equally inevitable now as before, it might have been as well, at least, to have let them meet it amid the comparative comforts they enjoyed in Egypt as to have it now coming upon them, amid scenes of desolation and the lingering horrors of want.

Such were the feelings expressed by the Israelites shortly after their entrance on the wilderness, and more than once expressed again as they became sensible of the troubles and perils of their new position.* If they had rightly interpreted the Lord's doings, and reposed due confidence in his declared purposes concerning them, they would have felt differently. They would have understood, that it was in the nature of things impossible for God to have redeemed them for the inheritance, and yet to suffer any inferior difficulties by the way to prevent them from coming to the possession of it. That redemption carried in its bosom a pledge of all other needful manifestations of divine love and faithfulness. For, being in itself the greatest, it implied, that the less should not be withheld, and being also the manifestation of a God, who in character, as in being, is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, it bespoke his readiness to give, in the future, similar manifestations of himself, in so far as they might be required.

The Israelites, however, who were still enveloped in much of the darkness and corruption of Egypt, though they were outwardly delivered from its thraldom, understood as yet comparatively little of this. They knew not how much they had to expect from God, as the JEHOVAH, the self-existent and unchangeable, who, as such,

* Ex. xv. 24; xvi. 2; xvii. 2, 3; Num. xi.; xx.

could not leave the people whom He had redeemed, to want and desolation, but must assuredly carry on and perfect what he had so gloriously begun. They readily gave way, therefore, to fears and doubts, and even broke out into open murmuring and discontent. But this only showed how much they had still to learn in the wilderness. There they found a school of preparation peculiarly suited to their present condition and future destiny—the more so because of the singular trials and difficulties which it called them to encounter. For what they most of all needed was a clearer insight into God's character, and a deeper consciousness of their covenant-relation to him. And for getting this, the wilderness was the proper field, since there the fascinating objects of the world no longer came between them and God; *there* their way was hedged up so that they could scarcely avoid coming into a more enlightened and intimate communion with him; constantly impelled by their necessities, on the one hand, to throw themselves upon his care, and drawn, on the other, by his gracious interpositions in their behalf, into a closer acquaintance with his character and goodness. By the things which they suffered, not less than those which they heard, they had to learn obedience, and ripen into a state of fitting preparation for the inheritance of the land of promise. Even with all the advantages which their course of wilderness-training possessed for this purpose, it proved insufficient for the generation that left Egypt with Moses; and the promise of God required to be suspended, till another generation had sprung up, in whom that training had been more thoroughly effectual. In later times, when their posterity began to fall from their proper destination, and obstinately refused to listen to the voice of reproof, the Lord had again to bring them into the wilderness condition, and put them through a process of trial and discipline similar to that which their forefathers had undergone.* And where is there now a genuine follower of the Lamb of God, having his face steadfastly set toward the heavenly Jerusalem, who does not in like manner march to it through the desert? Spiritually he enters upon such a desert the moment he takes up his Master's cross and begins to die to the world; the proper portion of his soul is henceforth in the land of rest and felicity before him. In respect to his higher interests, the world has become to him as a land of drought; and the crosses and trials, perplexities and bereavements, which are so often made to befall him by the way, are

* See especially the beautiful passage, Hos. ii. 14—23, which describes the means necessary for regenerating a depraved church, and God's future dealings with her, as if the whole were just to be a re-enacting of the transactions which occurred at the beginning of her history. The same mode of procedure was to be adopted now, which had then been acted on, though the outward scenes and operations were to be widely different. As a proof how little it is necessary to suppose the actual recurrence of the identical scenes and operations, in order to verify the import of such delineations, and how readily the most unlettered, if they be but Bible-instructed Christians, can enter into their proper meaning, the author would simply notice the case of an aged female of his acquaintance, in humble life, who has often expressed to him her relish for that above almost all other passages of Scripture, because so exactly descriptive of the Lord's dealings with her.

so many outward appliances, necessary to help out the deficiency of this heavenly elevation of mind; that by such means, if not otherwise, his heart may be weaned from the world, and suitably disciplined and prepared for the divine presence and glory.

In regard to the Lord's manifestations and dealings toward Israel during this peculiar portion of their history, the general principle unfolded is, that while he finds it needful to prescribe to his ransomed people a course of difficulty, trial and danger, before putting them in possession of the inheritance, he gives them meanwhile all that is required for their support and well-being, and brings to them discoveries of his gracious nearness to them and unfailing love, such as they could not otherwise have experienced.

1. This appeared, first of all, in the supply of food provided for them, and especially in the giving of manna, which the Lord sent them in the place of bread. It is true, that the manna might not necessarily form, nor can scarcely be supposed to have actually formed their only means of subsistence during the latter and longer period of their sojourn in the wilderness. For to say nothing of the quails, of which at first in kindness, and again in anger, a temporary supply was furnished them, (Ex. xvi., Numb. xi.,) there were within reach of the Israelites not a few resources of a common kind. The regions which they traversed, though commonly designated by the name of desert, are by no means uniform in their character, and contain in many places pasturage for sheep and cattle. Hence, considerable tribes have found it possible, from the most distant times, to subsist in them—such as the Ishmaelites, Midianites, Amalekites. That the Israelites afterwards availed themselves of the means of support which the wilderness afforded them, in common with these tribes of the desert, is clear from what is mentioned of their flocks and herds. They are expressly said to have left Egypt with very large property in these, (Ex. xii. 38,) and that they were enabled to preserve, and even, perhaps, to increase these possessions, we may gather from the notices subsequently given concerning them—especially from the mention made of the cattle, when they sought liberty to pass through the territory of Edom, (Numb. xx. 19,) and from the very large accumulation of flocks and herds by Gad and Reuben, which led to their obtaining a portion beyond the bounds of what was properly the promised land, (Numb. xxxii.) The Israelites thus had within themselves considerable resources as to the supply of food; and the sale of the skins and wool, and what they could spare from the yearly increase of their possessions, would enable them to purchase again from others. Besides, the treasure which they brought with them from Egypt, and the traffic which they might carry on in the fruit, spices, and other native productions of the desert, would furnish them with the means of obtaining provisions in the way of commerce. Nor have we any reason to think that the Israelites neglected these natural opportunities, but rather the reverse. For Moses retained his father-in-law with them, that, from his greater experience of the wilderness-life, he might

be serviceable to them in their journeyings and abodes, (Numb. x. 31,) and it would seem, that during the thirty-eight years of their sojourn, appointed in punishment for their unbelief, their encampment was in the neighbourhood of Mount Seir, where they had considerable advantages both for trade and pasturage.* So that the period of their sojourn in the wilderness may have been, and most probably *was*, far from being characterized by the inactivity and destitution which is commonly supposed; for Moses not only speaks of their buying provisions, but also of the Lord having "blessed them in *all the works of their hands*, and suffered them to lack nothing;" (Deut. ii. 6, 7.)†

It is clear, however, that these natural resources could only become available to the Israelites after they had lived for some time in the desert, and had come to be in a manner naturalized to it. To whatever extent they may have been indebted to such means of subsistence, it could only be during those thirty-eight years that they were doomed by the judgment of God to make the wilderness their home. And as that period formed a kind of halt in their progress, a sort of moral blank in their history, during which, as we shall see at the close of this chapter, the covenant and its more distinctive ordinances were suspended, we need not wonder if the things properly typical in their condition should also have suffered a measure of derangement. It is to these things, as they happened to them during their march through the wilderness and encampment around Sinai, that we are to look for the types (in their perfect form) of gospel realities. And there can be no doubt that, with reference to this period, the entire people were dependent upon manna for the chief part of their daily support. With a considerable proportion of the people, those who were in humbler circumstances, it must, indeed, have been so to the last. Therefore the nocturnal supply could not cease, though it may have varied in amount, till the people actually entered the territory of Canaan. It was the peculiar provision of Heaven for the necessities of the wilderness.‡

In regard to the manna itself, which formed the chief part of this extraordinary provision, the description given is, that it fell

* This is only a matter of probability, inferred from the account given of the stations in Numb. xxxv., of which the most southerly during the 38 years appears to have been Eziongeber, at the north point of the gulf of Akabah. From this point they again drew northwards the second time towards Kadesh.

† Vitringa, Obs. Sac. Lib. v. c. 15, and Hengstenberg's Bileam, p. 280. The latter, we think, makes them too independent of the manna.

‡ In Ex. xvi. 35, the supply of manna is spoken of as continuing till the people "came to a land inhabited," or to their reaching "the borders of Canaan." In Josh. v. 12, its actual cessation is said to have taken place only when they had entered Canaan, and ate the corn of the land. Hengstenberg's explanation of the matter does not seem to us quite satisfactory. But why might not the first passage, written in anticipation of the future, indicate generally the period during which the manna was given, namely, the seclusion of the people from a land in such a sense inhabited, that they were all dependent on miraculous supplies of food? Then the passage in Joshua records the fact, that this dependence actually ceased only when they had crossed the Jordan, and lay before Jericho; so that we may conclude their conquests to the east of Jordan, though in lands inhabited, had not sufficed till the period in question to furnish an adequate supply to their wants.

round about the camp by night with the dew; that it consisted of small whitish particles, compared to hoar-frost, coriander-seed, and pearls, (for so בדלח in Numb. xi. 7, should be rendered, not bdellium, see Bochart, Hieroz. P. ii. p. 675—7,) that it melted when exposed to the heat of the sun, and tasted like wafers made with honey, or like fresh oil. Now it seems that in certain parts of Arabia, and especially in that part which lies around Mount Sinai, a substance has been always found very much resembling this manna, and also bearing its name—the juice or gum of a kind of tamarisk tree, which grows in that region, called tarfa, oozing out chiefly by night in the month of June, and collected before sunrise by the natives. Such a fact was of course perfectly sufficient to entitle modern rationalists to conclude that there was no miracle in the matter, and that the Israelites merely collected and used a natural production of the region where they sojourned for a period. But even supposing the substance called manna to have been in both cases precisely the same, there was still ample room for the exertion of miraculous power in regard to the quantity; for the entire produce of the manna found in the Arabian peninsula, even in the most fruitful years, does not exceed 700 pounds, which, on the most moderate calculation, could not have furnished nearly the *thousandth part* necessary for *one day's* supply to the host of Israel! Besides the enormous disproportion, however, in regard to quantity, there were other things belonging to the manna of Scripture which clearly distinguish it from that found by naturalists—especially its falling with the dew and on the ground, as well as on plants, its consistence, rendering it capable of being used for bread, while the natural is rather a substitute for honey; its corrupting if kept beyond a day, and its coming in double quantities on the sixth day, and not falling at all on the seventh. If these properties, along with the immense abundance in which it was given, be not sufficient to constitute the manna of Scripture a miracle, and that of the first magnitude, we know not where any such could be found.

But this by no means proves the absence of all resemblance between the natural and the supernatural productions in question; and so far from there being any thing in that resemblance to disturb our ideas regarding the truth and reality of the miracle, we should rather see in it something to confirm them. For the supernatural presupposes the natural, and takes that for the ground out of which it rises. In extraordinary circumstances we might expect God, when the higher ends of his government required it, to work miraculously with the elements or productions of a particular region, but seeing the economy which manifests itself in all his operations, we should not expect him needlessly to increase the miraculous, by working in one region with those properly belonging to another. Thus, when our Lord proceeded to administer a miraculous supply of food to the hungry multitudes around him, he did not call into being articles of food unknown in Judea, but availed himself of the few loaves and fishes that were brought to his hand.

In like manner, when Jehovah was going to provide in the desert a substitute for the corn of "cultivated lands," why should he not have taken some production of the desert, though increased or otherwise modified so as to suit the end for which it was required? Surely it is according to all reason and analogy, that this corn of the desert should to some extent savour of the region with which it was connected; and the few striking resemblances it is found to bear to the produce of the Arabian tamarisk, are the stamp of verisimilitude and not of suspicion—the indication of such an affinity between the two as might justly be expected, from their being the common production of the same divine hand, only working miraculously in the one case, and naturally in the other.*

It is obvious that this miraculous supply of food for the desert, was in itself a provision for the bodily, and not for the spiritual nature of the Israelites. Hence, it is called by our Lord, "not the true bread that cometh down from heaven," because the life it was given to support was the fleshly one, which terminates in death: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead," (John vi. 32, 49, 50.) And even in this point of view the things connected with it have a use for us, apart altogether from any higher, typical or prospective reference they might also bear to gospel things. Lessons may be drawn from the giving and receiving of manna in regard to the interests and transactions of our present temporal life—properly and justly drawn; only, we must not confound these, as is too commonly done, with the lessons of another and higher kind, which it was intended as part of a preparatory dispensation, to teach regarding the food and nourishment of the soul. For example, the use made of it by the apostle in the second epistle to the Corinthians (viii. 15,) to enforce on the rich a charitable distribution of their means to the needy, so that there might be provided a sufficiency for all of these temporal goods, such as was found by the children of Israel on gathering the manna;—this has no respect to any typical bearing in the transaction, as in both cases alike it is the bodily and temporal life alone that is contemplated. In like manner we should regard it, not in a typical, but only in a common or historical point of view, if we should apply the fact of their being obliged to rise betimes and gather it with their own hands, to teach the duty of a diligent in-

* If this had been duly considered, Dr. Kitto, (Hist. of Palestine, i. p. 212,) and other writers, might have saved themselves the trouble of attempting to disprove any proper resemblance between the two kinds of manna—in which respect it is impossible to do more than to point out certain differences, which existed between the qualities of the one and the other.—It is also sufficient to expose the fanciful and merely superficial nature of many of the resemblances specified by typical writers between the manna and Christ. For example, the roundness of the manna, which was held to signify his eternal nature—its whiteness, which was viewed as emblematic of his holiness, and its sweetness, of the delight the participation of him affords to believers,—these qualities the manna had simply *as* manna, as possessing to a certain extent the properties of that production of the desert. In such things there was nothing peculiar or supernatural; and it is as unwarrantable to search for spiritual mysteries in them, as it would be for a like purpose to analyze the qualities and appearance of the water which issued from the rock, and which, so applied, would convey in some respects a directly opposite instruction.

dustry in our worldly callings; or the other fact of its breeding worms when unnecessarily hoarded and kept beyond the appointed time, to show the folly of men labouring to heap up possessions which they cannot profitably use, and which must be found only a source of trouble and annoyance. Such applications of the historical details regarding the manna are in themselves perfectly legitimate and proper, but are quite out of place when put by many writers among its typical bearings. And hence, putting such applications of the history among its typical bearings, they are obliged arbitrarily to shift the relations when they come to the double portion on the last day of the week, that there might be an unbroken day of rest on the Sabbath; for if considered, as in the examples given above, with reference merely to what is to be done or enjoyed on earth, the instruction would be false—the day of rest being the season, above all others, on which, in a spiritual point of view, men should ply the work and calling of a Christian. They are here, therefore, under the necessity of mixing up the present with the future, making the six days represent time, during which salvation is to be sought, and the seventh, eternity, during which it is to be enjoyed. Yet there is an important use of this part also of the arrangement regarding the manna, in reference to the present life, apart altogether from the typical bearing. For when the Lord sent that double portion on the last day of the week, and none on the next, it was as much as to say, that in his providential arrangements for this world, he had given only six days for worldly labour, and that if men would heartily fall in with his plan, they would find they were no losers by doing so,—they would find that in the long run they got as much by their six days' labour, as they either needed or could profitably use, and would have, besides, their weekly day of rest for spiritual refreshment and bodily repose. Nor can we regard this lesson of small moment in the eye of Heaven, when we see no fewer than three miracles wrought every week for forty years to enforce it, namely, a double portion of manna on the sixth day, none on the seventh, and the preservation of the portion for the seventh from corrupting when kept beyond the usual time.

When we come, however, to consider what is written of the manna in its typical bearing, as representative of the higher and better things of the gospel, we must remember that there are two distinct classes of relations—corresponding, indeed, yet still distinct, since the one has immediate respect only to the seen and the temporal, and the other to the unseen and the eternal. In both cases alike there is a redeemed people, travelling through a wilderness to the inheritance promised to them, and prepared for them, and receiving as they proceed the peculiar provision they require for the support of life, from the immediate hand of God: But in the one case, it is the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh, redeemed from the outward bondage and oppression of Egypt, at the most from bodily death, in the other the spiritual members of an elect church redeemed from the curse and condemnation of sin; in the one the literal wilderness of Arabia, lying

between Egypt and Palestine, in the other the figurative wilderness of a present world; in the one manna, in the other Christ. That we are warranted to connect the two together in this manner, and to see the one, as it were, in the other, is not simply to be inferred from some occasional passages of Scripture, but is rather to be grounded on the general nature of the Old Testament dispensation, as intended to prepare the way, by means of its visible and earthly relations, for the spiritual and divine realities of the gospel. Whatever is implied in this general connexion, however, is in the case of the manna not obscurely intimated by our Lord in the sixth chapter of St. John's gospel, where he represents himself with evident reference to it, as "the bread which cometh down from heaven;" and is clearly taken for granted by the apostle Paul, when he calls it "the spiritual meat" of which the Israelites did all eat, (1 Cor. x. 3.) Not as if in eating that they of necessity found nourishment to their souls; but such meat being God's special provision for a redeemed people, had an ordained connexion with the mysteries of God's kingdom, and, as such, contained a pledge that he who consulted so graciously for the life of the body, would infallibly make equal provision for the life of the soul,—as he has now done in Christ. The following may be presented as the chief points of instruction, which in this respect are conveyed by the history of the manna:

(1.) It was given in consideration of a great and urgent necessity. A like necessity lies at the foundation of God's gift of his Son to the world; it was not possible in the nature of things for any other resource to be found; and the actual bestowment of the gift was delayed till the fullest demonstration had been given in the history of the church and the world that such a provision was indispensable.

(2.) The manna was peculiarly the gift of God, coming freely and directly from his hand. It fell by night with the dew, (Numb. xi. 9,) which is itself the gift of Heaven, sent to fertilize the earth and enable it to yield increase for the food of man and beast. But in the wilderness, where, as there is no sowing, there can be no increase, if bread still comes with the dew, it must be in a sense quite peculiar, the produce of heaven—hence called "the corn," or "bread of heaven," (Ps. lxxviii. 24, cv. 40.) How striking a representation in this respect of Christ, all Scripture may be said to testify, as both in his person and in the purchased blessings of his redemption, he is always presented to sinful men as the free gift of the Father's love.

(3.) But plentiful, as well as free; the whole fulness of the Godhead is in Jesus, so that all may receive as their necessities require; no one needs to grudge his neighbour's portion, but all rather may rejoice together in the ample beneficence of Heaven. So was it also with the manna; for when distribution was made, there was enough for all, and even he who had gathered least still had no lack.

(4.) Then, falling as it did round about the camp, it was near enough to be within the reach of all; if any should perish for want,

it could be from no outward necessity or hardship, for the means of supply were brought almost to their very hand. Nor is it otherwise in regard to Christ, who in the gospel of his grace is laid, in a manner, at the door of every sinner; the word is nigh him; and if he should still perish, he must be without excuse—it is in sight of the bread of life.

(5.) The supply of manna came daily, and faith had to be exercised on the providence of God, that each day would bring its appointed provision; if they attempted to hoard for the morrow, their store became a mass of corruption. In like manner must the child of God pray for his soul every morning as it dawns, "Give me this day my daily bread." He can lay up no stock of grace, which is to last him for a continuance, without needing to repair to the treasury of Christ; and if he begins to live upon former experiences, or to feel as if he already stood so high in the life of God, that, like Peter, he can of himself confidently reckon on his superiority to temptation, his very mercies become fraught with trouble, and he is the worse rather than the better, for the fulness imparted to him. His soul can be in health and prosperity only while he is every day "living by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him, and gave himself for him."

(6.) Finally, as the manna had to be gathered in the morning of each day, and a double portion provided on the sixth day, that the seventh might be hallowed as a day of sacred rest; so Christ and the things of his salvation must be sought with diligence and regularity—but only in the appointed way and through the divinely-provided channels. There must be no neglect of seasonable opportunities on the one hand, nor, on the other, any overvaluing of one ordinance to the neglect of another. We cannot prosper in our course, unless it is pursued as God himself authorizes and appoints.

There is nothing uncertain or fanciful in such analogies; for they have not only the correspondence between Israel's temporal, and the church's spiritual condition to rest upon, but the character also of an unchangeable God. His principles of dealing with his church are the same for all ages. When transacting with his people now directly for the support of the spiritual life, he must substantially re-enact what he did of old, when transacting with them directly for the support of their bodily life; and the faith of the Christian is only acting a suitable and becoming part, when it leads him back to this memorable transaction in the desert, to learn there the fulness of its privilege, and the nature of its obligations in regard to the divine provision furnished for the necessities of his soul.

II. But Israel in the wilderness required something more than manna to preserve them in safety and vigour for the inheritance; they needed refreshment as well as support—"a stay of water," not less than "a staff of bread." And the account given respecting this is contained in the chapter immediately following that which records the appointment of God respecting the manna (Ex. xvii.) Here also the gift was preceded by a murmuring and discontent on the part of the Israelites. So little had they yet learned

from the past manifestations of divine power and faithfulness, and so much had sight the ascendency over faith in their character, that they even spoke as if certain destruction were before them, and caused Moses to tremble for his life. But however improperly they demeaned themselves, as there was a real necessity in their condition, which nothing but an immediate and extraordinary exertion of divine power could relieve, Moses received the command from God, after supplicating his interposition, to go with the elders of Israel and smite the rock in Horeb with his rod, under the assurance, which was speedily verified, that water in abundance would stream forth.*

The Apostle says of this rock, that it followed the Israelites (1 Cor. x. 4.) And some of the Jewish Rabbis have fabled that it did literally move from its place in Horeb and accompany them through the wilderness; so that the rock, which nearly forty years after was smitten in Kadesh, was the identical rock which had been originally smitten in Horeb.† We need scarcely say, that such was not the meaning of the Apostle. But as the rock at Horeb comes into view, not as something by itself, but simply as connected with the water, which divine power constrained it to yield, it might justly be spoken of as following them, if the waters flowing from it went after them in their course. That this, to some extent, was actually the case, may be inferred from the great profusion, with which they are declared to have been given—"gushing out," it is said, "like overflowing streams," and "running like a river in the dry places;" (Ps. lxxviii. 20; cv. 41; Isaiah xlviii. 31.) It is also the nearly unanimous opinion of interpreters, both ancient and modern, and the words of the apostle so manifestly imply this, that we can scarcely call it any thing but a conceit in St. Chrysos-

* This occurrence must not be confounded with another somewhat similar, of which an account is given in Num. xx. This latter occurrence took place at Kadesh, and not till the beginning of the fortieth year of the sojourn in the wilderness—when the period of their abode there was drawing to a close (comp. ch. xx. with ch. xxxiii. 36–39.) On account of the rebellious conduct of the people, Moses called the rock smitten, in both cases, by the name of Meribah, or Strife. But as the occasions were far separate, both as to space and time, the last was also unhappily distinguished from the first, in that Moses and Aaron so far transgressed as to forfeit their right to enter the promised land. Aaron was coupled with Moses both in the sin and the punishment; but it is the case of Moses which is most particularly noticed. His sin is characterized in ch. xx. 12, by his "not believing God," and in v. 24, and ch. xxvii. 14, as a "rebelling against the word of God." Again, in Deut. i. 37, iii. 26, iv. 21, the punishment is said to have been laid on Moses "for their sakes," or, as it should rather be, "because of their words." The proper account of the matter seems to be this; Moses, through their chiding lost command of himself, and did the work appointed, not as God's messenger, in a spirit of faith and holiness, but in a state of carnal and passionate excitement, under the influence of that wrath which worketh not the righteousness of God. The punishment he received, it may seem, was peculiarly severe for such an offence; but it was designed to produce a salutary impression upon the people in regard to the evil of sin; for when they saw that their misconduct had so far prevailed over their venerable leader as to prevent even him from entering Canaan, how much was the circumstance fitted to operate as a solemn check upon them in the time to come! And then, as Moses and Aaron were in the position of greatest nearness to God, and had it especially in charge to represent God's holiness to the people, the least falling from their steadfastness in them was of serious import, and required to be marked with a strong proof of the Lord's displeasure.

† Buxtorf. Exercit. p. 420.

tom (who is followed, however, by Horsley, on Ex. xvii.,) to regard the apostle there as speaking of Christ personally. But we are not thereby warranted in supposing, with some Jewish writers, that the waters flowing from the rock in Horeb, so closely and necessarily connected themselves with the march of the Israelites, that the stream rose with them to the tops of mountains, as well as descended into the valleys.* Considering how nearly related the Lord's miraculous working in regard to the manna stood to his natural working, and how he required the care and co-operation of his people to go along with him in making the miraculous provision effectual to the supply of their wants, we might rather conceive, that their course was directed so as to admit of the water easily following them, though not, perhaps, without the application of some labour on their part to provide for it a passage, and suitable reservoirs. Nor are we to imagine, that they would require this water, any more than the manna, always in the same quantities during the whole period of their sojourn in the wilderness. They might even be sometimes wholly independent of it; as we know for certain it had failed them when they reached the neighbourhood of Kadesh, and were on their way to the country of the Moabites (Num. xx. and xxi.) It was God's special provision for the desert —for the land of drought; and did not need to be given in any quantities, or directed into any channel, but what their necessities as connected with such a land might require.†

Understanding this, however, to be the sense in which the rock followed the Israelites, what does the apostle farther mean by saying, that "that rock was Christ?" Does he wish us to understand, that the rock typically represented Christ? And so represented him, that in drinking of the water which flowed from it, they at the same time received Christ? Was the drink furnished to the Israelites, in such a sense spiritual, that it conveyed Christ to them? In that case the flowing forth and drinking of the water must have had in it the nature of a sacrament, and answered to our spiritually eating and drinking of Christ in the Supper. This, unquestionably, is the view adopted by the ablest and soundest divines; although there are certain limitations, which must be understood. The apostle is evidently drawing a parallel between the case of the church in the wilderness and that of the church under the gospel, with an especial reference to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, under the guidance and direction of Moses, he represents as a sort of baptism to him; because in the same manner, in which Christian baptism seals spiritually the believer's death to sin, his

* Lightfoot, on 1 Cor. x. 4.

† The exact route pursued by the Israelites from Sinai to Canaan, is still a matter of uncertainty. At some of the places, where they are supposed to have rested, there are considerable supplies of water (See Bib. Cyclop. Art. Wandering.) It is, however, certain, that the region of Sinai is very elevated, and that not only are the mountain-ridges immensely higher than the south of Palestine, but the ground slopes from the base to a considerable distance all around—so that the water would naturally flow so far with the Israelites—how far has not been ascertained.

separation from the world, and calling of God to sit in heavenly places with Christ, in the very same, outwardly, did the passage through the Red Sea seal the death of Israel to the bondage of Pharaoh, their separation from Egypt, and their expectation of the inheritance promised them by Moses. In what he says regarding the manna and the rock, he does not expressly name the ordinance of the Supper; but there can be no doubt that he has its elements in view, when he calls the one the spiritual food, of which the Israelites ate, and the other the spiritual drink of which they drank, naming also the latter Christ (which he might equally, of course, have done in respect to the bread.) Such language, however, cannot have been meant to imply, that the manna and the water directly and properly symbolized Christ, in the same sense in which the bread and wine of the supper do. For the immediate design and use of the manna and the water had respect to the supply of the people's bodily necessities; for this alone they were ostensibly given; and hence our Lord, speaking of what the manna was, in itself, and depreciating its value in respect to men's higher natures, declared to the Jews, it was not the true bread of heaven, as was clearly proved by those perishing in the wilderness who partook of it. Not, therefore, directly and purposely, but only in a remote, concealed, typical sense, could the apostle intend his expressions of spiritual food and drink to be understood. Still less could he mean, that all who partook of these did consciously and believingly receive Christ through them to salvation. The facts he presently mentions regarding so many of them being smitten down in the wilderness by the judgments of God for their sins, too clearly proved the reverse of that. The very purpose, indeed, for which he there introduces their case to the notice of the Corinthian Church, is to warn the disciples to beware lest they should fall after the same example of unbelief; lest after enjoying the privileges of the Christian church, they should, by carnal indulgence, lose their interest in the heavenly inheritance, as so many had done in regard to the earthly inheritance, notwithstanding that they had partaken of the corresponding privileges of the Jewish Church. But as the bread and wine in the Supper may still be called spiritual food and drink, might even be called by the name of Christ, who is both the living bread and the living water, which they represent, although many partake of them unworthily, and perish in their sins; so manifestly might the manna and the water of the desert be so called, Christ being typically represented in them, while still thousands did not perceive any reference to him in them, and lived and died as far from Christ as the wretched idolaters of Egypt.

In perceiving the higher things typically represented by the water flowing from the rock, the Israelites stood at an immense disadvantage compared with believers under the gospel; and how far any did perceive them it is impossible for us to determine. In regard to the great mass, who both now and on so many other occasions showed themselves incapable of putting forth even the lowest exercises of faith, it is but too evident that they did not descry there

the faintest glimpse of Christ. But, for such as really were children of faith, we may easily understand how they might go a certain way at least, in rising through the provisions then administered, to the expectation of better things to come. They must, then, have discerned in the inheritance which they were travelling to inherit, not the ultimate good itself, which God had destined for his chosen, but only its terrestrial type and pledge—something which would be for the present life, what, in the resurrection, the other would be for the spiritual and immortal life. But, discerning this, it could not be difficult for them to proceed one step farther, and apprehend, that what God was now doing to them on their way to the temporal inheritance, by those outward, material provisions for the bodily life, he did not for that alone, but also as a sign and pledge, that such provision as he had made for the lower necessities of their nature, he must assuredly have made, and would in his own time fully disclose for the higher. And thus, while receiving from the hand of their redeeming God, the food and refreshment required for those bodily natures which were to enjoy the pleasant mountains and valleys of Canaan, they might at the same time be growing in clearness of view and strength of assurance, as regarded their interest in the imperishable treasures which belong to the future kingdom of God—and their relation to Him, who was to be pre-eminently the seed of blessing, and "to the bundle of life, which is bound up (with him) before the Lord."

But, however much or little those for whom the rock poured out its refreshing streams may have been enabled to do in reading the import of the type, for us who can look back upon it from the high vantage-ground of gospel realities, it yields in regard to these realities themselves a clear and definite instruction. But, in seeking for this, we must be careful to look to the real and essential lines of agreement, and not fix upon such as are merely accidental. It is not the rock properly that we have to do with, or to any of its distinctive qualities, as is commonly imagined, but the supply of water issuing from it, to supply the thirst and refresh the natures of the famishing Israelites. No doubt, the apostle, when referring to the transaction, speaks of the rock itself and of its following them, but plainly meaning by this, as we have stated, the water that flowed from it. No doubt also, Christ is often in Scripture represented as a rock; but when he is so, it is always with respect to the qualities properly belonging to a rock—its strength, its durability, or the protection it is capable of affording from the heat of a scorching sun. These natural qualities of the rock, however, do not come into consideration here; they did not render it in the least degree fitted for administering the good actually derived from it, but rather the reverse. There was not only no *seeming*, but also no *real* aptitude in the rock to yield the water; while in Christ, though he appeared to have no form or comeliness, there still was every thing that was required to constitute him a fountain-head of life and blessing. Then, the smiting of the rock by Moses with the rod, could not suggest the idea of

any thing like violence done to it, nor was the action itself done by Moses as the lawgiver, but as the mediator, between God and the people; while the smiting of Christ, which is commonly held to correspond with this, consisted in the bruising of his soul with the suffering of death, and that not inflicted, but borne by him as Mediator. There is no real correspondence in these respects between the type and the antitype; and the manner in which it is commonly made out, is nothing more than a specious accommodation of the language of the transaction, to ideas, which the transaction itself could never have suggested.*

The points of instruction are chiefly the following:—

(1.) Christ ministers to his people abundance of spiritual refreshment, while they are on their way to the heavenly inheritance. They need this to carry them onward through the trials and difficulties that lie in their way; and he is ever ready to impart it. "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." What he then did in the region of the bodily life, he cannot but be disposed to do over again in the higher region of the spiritual life; for there the necessity is equally great, and the interests involved are unspeakably greater. Let the believer, when parched in spirit, and feeling in heaviness, through manifold temptations, throw himself back upon this portion of Israel's history, and he will see written, as with a sunbeam, the assurance, that the Saviour of Israel, who fainteth not, nor is weary, will satisfy the longing soul and pour living water upon him that is thirsty.

(2.) In providing and ministering this refreshment, he will break through the greatest hinderances and impediments. If his people but thirst, nothing can prevent them from being partakers of the blessing. "He makes for them rivers in the desert;" the very rock turns into a flowing stream; and the valley of Baca (weeping,) is found to contain its pools of refreshment, at which the travellers to Zion revive their flagging spirits, and go from strength to strength. How often have the darkest providences, and circumstances, that seemed beforehand pregnant only with destruction, become, through the gracious presence of the Mediator, the source of deepest joy and consolation!

(3.) "The rock by its water accompanied the Israelites—so Christ by his Spirit goes with his disciples even to the end of the world." (Grotius.) The refreshments of his grace are confined to no region, and last through all ages. Wherever the genuine believer is, there they also are. And more highly favoured than even

* This has been done most strikingly by Toplady, in the beautiful hymn, "Rock of ages cleft for me," which derives its imagery in part from this transaction of the wilderness. Considered, however, in a critical point of view, or with reference to the real meaning of the transaction, it is liable to the objections stated in the text; it confounds things, which essentially differ. Ainsworth produces a Jewish comment, which seems to justify the interpretation usually put on it: "The turning of the rock into water, was the turning of the property of judgment, signified by the rock, into the property of mercy, signified by the water." But Jewish comments, on this as well as most subjects, require to be applied with discrimination, as there is scarcely either an unsound, or a sound view, for confirmation of which something may not be derived from them.

Israel in the wilderness, he has them in his own bosom—he has there "a well of water springing up unto life everlasting," so that "out of his belly can flow rivers of living water."

III. The only other point, apart from the giving of the law, of any moment respecting the march through the wilderness, was the pillar of fire and cloud, in which from the first the Lord accompanied and led the people. The appearance of this symbol of the divine presence was various, but it is uniformly spoken of as itself one—a lofty column rising toward heaven. By day it would seem to have expanded as it rose, and spread itself as a kind of shade or curtain between the Israelites and the sun, as the Lord is said by means of it to have "spread a cloud for a covering," (Ps. cv. 39,) while by night it exchanged the cloudy for the illuminated form, and diffused throughout the camp a pleasant light. At first it went before the army, pointing the way, but after the tabernacle was made, it became more immediately connected with this, though sometimes appearing to rest more closely on it, and sometimes to rise higher aloft.* The lucid or fiery form seems to have been the prevailing one, or rather, to have always essentially belonged to it, (hence called, not only, "pillar of fire," but "light of fire," אור אש, i. e. lucid matter presenting the appearance of fire,) only during the day the circumambient cloud usually prevented the light from being seen. Sometimes, however, as when a manifestation of divine glory needed to be given to overawe and check the insolence of the people, or when some special revelation was to be given to Moses, the fire discovered itself through the cloud. So that it may be described, as a column of fire surrounded by a cloud, the one or the other appearance becoming predominant, according as the divine purpose required, but that of fire being more peculiarly identified with the glory of God. (Numb. xvi. 42.)

(1.) Now, as the Lord chose this for the visible symbol, in which he would appear as the Head and Leader of his people, when conducting them through the wilderness, there must have been, first of all, in the symbol itself something fitted to display his character and glory. For there must have been a propriety and significance in selecting this, rather than something else, as the seat, in which Jehovah, or the angel of his presence appeared, and the form in which he manifested his glory.† But fire, or a shining flame enveloped by a cloud, is one of the fittest and most natural symbols of the true God, as dwelling, not simply in light, but "in light that is inaccessible and full of glory,"—light and glory within the cloud. The fire, however, was itself not uniform in its appearance, but, according to the threefold distinction of Isaiah, (ch. iv. 5,) sometimes appeared as *light*, sometimes as a *radiant splendour* or glory, and sometimes again as flaming, or *burning fire*. In each of these

* Ex. xiii. 21, 22, xiv. 19, xl. 34–38; Numb. ix. 15–23. This subject has been carefully investigated by Vitringa in his Obs. Sac. l. v. c. 14–17, to which we must refer for more details than can be given here. What is given in the text claims to be little more than an abstract of his observations.

† For the essential identity of Jehovah, and the angel of his presence in connexion with this symbol, comp. Ex. xiii. 21, xiv. 19, xxiii. 20.

respects it pointed to a corresponding feature in the divine character. As light, it represented God as the fountain of all truth and purity (Isa. lx. 1, 19; 1 John i. 5; Rev. xx. 23, xxii. 5.) As splendour, it indicated the glory of his character, which consists in the manifestation of his infinite perfections, and especially in the display of his surpassing goodness, as connected with the redemption of his people—on which account the "showing of his glory," is explained by "making his goodness pass before Moses," (Ex. xxxiii. 18, 19; comp. also Isa. xl. 5.) For, as nothing appears to the natural eye more brilliant than the shining brightness of fire, so nothing to the spiritual eye can be compared with these manifestations of the gracious attributes of God. And as nothing in nature is so awfully commanding and intensely powerful in consuming as the burning flame of fire, so in this respect again it imaged forth the terrible power and majesty of his holiness, which makes him jealous of his own glory, and a consuming fire to the workers of iniquity. Hence the cloud assumed this aspect, preeminently on Mount Sinai, when the Lord came down to give that fundamental revelation of his holiness, the law of the ten commandments (Ex. xxiv. 17; Deut. iv. 24; Isa. xxxiii. 14, 15; Heb. xii. 29.) Still, whatever the Lord discovered of himself in these respects to his ancient people, it was with much reserve and imperfection; they saw him, indeed, but only through a veil; and therefore the glory shone forth through a cloud of thick darkness.

No doubt, this is the case to a great extent still. God even yet has his dwelling in unapproachable light; and with all the discoveries of the gospel, he is only seen "as through a glass darkly." This feature, however, of the divine manifestations falls more into the back-ground in the gospel; since God has now in very deed dwelt with men on the earth, and given such revelations of himself by Christ, that "he who hath seen him," may be said to have "seen the Father." It seems now, comparing the revelations of God in the New with those of the Old Testament, as if the pillar of cloud were in a measure removed, and the pillar of fire alone remained. And in each one of the aspects which this fire assumed, we find the corresponding feature most fully verified in Christ. He is the light of men. The glory of the Father shines forth in him as full of grace and truth. He alone has revealed the Father, and can give the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him. Therefore, he is the Word or revelation of God, and the effulgence of his glory. And while merciful and compassionate in the last degree to sinners—the very personification of love, he yet has eyes like a flame of fire, and his feet as of burning brass, and he walks amid the golden candle-sticks, as he did in the camp of Israel, to bring to light the hidden works of darkness, and cause his indignation to flame out against the hypocrites.*

(2.) But besides being a symbol of the Lord's revealed character, the pillar of fire and cloud had certain offices to perform to the

* John i. 4, 5, 11, viii. 12, ix. 5; Matt. xi. 27; Eph. i. 17; Heb. i. 3; Rev. i. 14, 15, ii. iii. &c.

Israelites. These were for guidance and protection. It was by this, that the Lord directed their course through the dreary and trackless waste, which lay between Egypt and Canaan, showing them when to set forth, in what direction to proceed, where to abide, and also affording light to their steps, when the journey was by night. For this purpose, when the people marched, the ark of the covenant went foremost (not in the centre, as is sometimes supposed,) and the pillar accompanied it, being the part most immediately connected with the person of God, (Numb. iv. 4, 5, x. 17, 33.) In addition to these gracious benefits, it also served as a shade from the heat of a scorching sun, and on one occasion, at least—when the Israelites were closely pursued by the Egyptians —it stood as a wall of defence between them and their enemies.

That in all this the pillar of fire and cloud performed externally and visibly the part which is now discharged by Christ toward his people in the spiritual and divine life, is too evident to require any illustration. He reveals himself to them as the Captain of Salvation, who conducts them through the wilderness of life, and brings them in safety to his Father's house. He never leaves them alone, but by his word and Spirit leads them into all the truth—assuring them of his continual nearness to comfort them in their troubles, and support them under their manifold temptations. He presents himself to their view, as having gone before them in the way, and appoints them to no field of trial, or conflict with evil, through which he has not already passed as their forerunner. Whatever wisdom is needed to direct, whatever grace to overcome, they are entitled to expect it from his hand; he is their shield, so that the sun shall not be permitted to smite them by day, nor the moon by night; and "when the blast of the terrible ones comes as a storm against the wall," they have in him a "refuge from the storm, and a shadow from the heat." Does it seem too much to expect so great things from him? Or does faith, struggling with the infirmities of the flesh, and the temptations of the world, find it hard at times to apprehend the spiritual reality? Let it go and quicken its fainting energies by looking at the visible manifestations of God in the wilderness. Let it mark there the goings of the divine shepherd with his people; and doubt not, that as he can neither change, nor deny himself, but is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, what was then done to the eye of sense, and on the open territory of a visible world, he cannot fail to be ever substantially repeating in the inward experience of a redeemed people to the end of time.

The whole of what has been said regarding the sojourn in the wilderness, has reference more immediately to the comparatively brief period during which properly the Israelites *should* have been there. The frequent outbreakings of a rebellious spirit, and especially the dreadful revolt, which arose on the return of the spies from searching the land of Canaan, so manifestly proved them to be unfit for the proper occupation of the promised land, that the

Lord determined to retain them in the wilderness till the older portion—those who were above twenty years when they left Egypt, had all perished. It was some time in the second year after their departure, that this decree was passed concerning them; and the period fixed in the decree being, in round numbers, forty years, a year for every day the spies had been employed in searching the land, including, however, what had been already spent, there remained the long term of upwards of thirty-eight years, during which, the promise of God was suffered to fall into abeyance. Of what passed during this dismal period scarcely any thing is recorded. The only circumstances noticed concerning it are those connected with the punishment of the Sabbath-breaker, and the rebellion of Korah and his company. How far the miraculous provision for the desert was affected by the change in question, we are not told, though we may naturally infer it to have been to some extent,—to such an extent as might render it proper, if not necessary, to bring into play all the available resources naturally belonging to the region. It was a time of judgment, and the very silence of Scripture concerning it is ominous. That the Lord wished them to regard their condition as at once a sad and anomalous one, is evident from what is recorded at the close of the period in Josh. v. 2–9, where we are told, that from the period of their coming under the judgment of the Lord up till that time, they had not been circumcised; the reason of which we are plainly given to understand was, that they "had not obeyed the voice of the Lord." And now when the circumcision was renewed, and the whole company became a circumcised people, "The Lord said unto Joshua, This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you."

What is meant here by the reproach of Egypt is not the reproach or shame of the sin they had contracted in Egypt, intimating that that impure state was now at an end, and that they had now at length entered on a comparatively pure, properly a new condition. The thing meant, is the reproach, which the people of Egypt were all this time casting upon them for the unhappy circumstances in which they were placed. It was that reproach, which Moses so much dreaded, on a former occasion, when he prayed the Lord not to pour out his indignation on the people to consume them: "For wherefore (says he) should the Egyptians say, For mischief did he bring them out to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth!" (Ex. xxxiii. 12.) And this reproach was again the first thought that presented itself to the mind of Moses, when, on the occasion of the return of the spies, the Lord threatened to consume the mass of the people, and raise a new seed from Moses himself: "Then the Egyptians shall hear it, (for thou broughtest up this people in thy might from among them,) and they will tell it to the inhabitants of this land," &c. (Numb. xiv. 13–16.) The ground and occasion of the reproach was, that the Lord had not fulfilled in their behalf the grand promise of the covenant, for the realization of which they had left Egypt which such high hopes and such great glory.

So far from having obtained what was promised, they had been made to wander like forlorn outcasts through the wilds and wildernesses of Arabia, where their carcasses were continually falling into a dishonoured grave. The covenant, in short, was for a time suspended—the people were lying under the ban of Heaven; and it was fitting that the ordinance of circumcision, the sacrament of the covenant, should be suspended too. But now that they were again received through circumcision into the full standing and privileges of a covenant-condition, it was a proof that the judgment of God had expired—that their proper relation to him was again restored—that he was ready to carry into execution the promise, on which he had caused them to hope, and that, consequently, the ground of Egypt's reproach, as would presently be seen, was entirely rolled away.*

It would seem, as might also have naturally been expected, on the supposition of this view of the case being correct, that the celebration of what might now be called the other sacrament of the covenant, the Passover, was suspended during the same period. We read of its having been celebrated at the beginning of the second year after their departure from Egypt (Numb. ix.,) but never again till the renewal of circumcision on the borders of Canaan, (Josh. v. 10.) The same cause which brought a suspension of the one ordinance, of necessity implied a virtual prohibition to celebrate the other. The more so, indeed, as it was the children who were more directly concerned in the ceasing of circumcision, while the non-celebration of the passover directly touched the parents themselves. Even in regard to the ordinance of circumcision, the parents could not but conclude, that as it had been suspended from being the peculiar sign of the covenant, their circumcision had become in a manner uncircumcision. On *their* account, the flow of the divine goodness toward the congregation, had meanwhile received a check as to its outward manifestation; and even what was promised, and in reserve for their children, must for the present lie over till the time set for favouring them had come.

But the question will naturally occur, Did the whole of that generation, which came out of Egypt as full-grown men, actually perish without an interest in the mercy of God? Did they really live and die under the solemn ban of Heaven, aliens from his true commonwealth, and strangers to his covenant of promise? Was not Aaron, was not Moses himself one of those, who bore in this respect the punishment of iniquity, and died while the church was without its sacraments? Yes; and we may hence, with the utmost

* See Hengstenberg's Authentie, ii. p. 17. The opinion thrown out by the author of the art. Circumcision in the Bib. Cyclopædia: "Knowing that the Egyptians were circumcised, it no longer remains doubtful how *the reproach of Egypt* in Josh. v. 9, should be interpreted," will require no special refutation after what has been stated. There were far more solid grounds in the case for taking up a reproach, than the simple want of circumcision; and besides, it is not certain that the Egyptians were accustomed to reproach those who were uncircumcised. It is even somewhat doubtful if any but the priests were regularly circumcised, at least counted it an honour or distinctive mark to be so.

certainty, conclude that there was mercy mingled with the judgment. The Lord did not cease to be the gracious God, long-suffering, and plenteous in goodness to those who truly sought him. Only they had then to seek him under peculiar disadvantages, and in the absence of signs and tokens of his favour granted in all ordinary circumstances. His grace was still there, as it is in every judgment he executes on his professing people in this world; but it was grace in a mystery—grace as dropping from an overhanging cloud, rather than as shining forth from a clear and serene sky. Hence, while the two greatest ordinances of the church were suspended, others were still left to encourage their hope in the Lord's mercy: there was the pillar of fire and cloud, the tabernacle of testimony, the altar of sacrifice, and others besides. So that, to use the words of Calvin, who had a far better discernment of the anomalous state of things, which then existed, than the great majority of the commentators since: "In one part only were the people excommunicated; there still were means of support to bear them up, that (the truly penitent) might not sink into despair. As if a father should lift up his hand to drive from him a disobedient son, and yet with the other should hold him back—at once terrifying him with frowns and chastisements, yet still unwilling that he should go into exile."

The feelings, to which this very peculiar state of Israel gave rise, are beautifully expressed in the 90th Psalm—whether actually written by Moses or not—which breathes throughout the mournful language of a people suffering under the judgment of God, and yet exercising hope in his mercy. We need have no doubt, therefore, that subjects of grace died in the wilderness, just as afterwards, when the covenant with most of its ordinances was again suspended, subjects of grace, even pre-eminent grace, were carried to Babylon and died there. Yet there is much reason to fear, in regard to the Israelites in the wilderness, that the number of such were comparatively few, both on account of the nature of the judgment itself, and from the testimonies of the prophets, (especially Ez. xx. and Amos v. 25, 26,) concerning the great extent, to which the leaven of Egyptian corruption still wrought among them.

This remarkable portion of God's dealings is well fitted to impress upon us the following truths, important for every age of the church. 1. The tendency of sin to root itself in the soul: when it once fairly obtains a footing there, it will resist all that is wonderful in mercy, and terrible in judgment. For what astonishing sights had not those men witnessed! what awful displays of God's justice! what glorious exhibitions of his goodness! Yet in the case of most of them, all proved to be in vain. 2. The honour God puts upon his ordinances, especially the sacraments of his covenant. These are for the true children of the covenant; and it is in his sight a proper thing that they should be hindered from access to them, who do not appear to possess the character of children. 3. The inseparable connexion between the promise of God's covenant and the holiness of his people. The inheritance cannot be entered into

and possessed but by a believing, spiritual, and holy people. God *must* have such a people, and till he could get them he would let his inheritance lie waste; because such only could serve the ends and purposes for which the inheritance was provided. And on that account, God is waiting so long now, before he brings in the everlasting inheritance of life and glory. It is for those only of clean hands and a pure heart; and till the destined number of such is prepared and ready, it must be known only as an "inheritance reserved in heaven." 4. Finally, what a fearful guilt attaches to a backsliding and corrupt church! It stays the fountain of God's mercy—it brings reproach on his name and cause—and compels him, in a manner, to do evil to those whom he would rather—how much rather?—establish and bless.

PART II.

THE DIRECT INSTRUCTION GIVEN TO THE ISRAELITES BEFORE THE ERECTION OF THE TABERNACLE, AND THE INSTITUTION OF ITS SYMBOLICAL SERVICES—THE LAW.

CHAPTER I.

WHAT PROPERLY, AND IN THE STRICTEST SENSE, TERMED THE LAW, VIZ. THE DECALOGUE—ITS PERFECTION AND COMPLETENESS BOTH AS TO THE ORDER AND SUBSTANCE OF ITS PRECEPTS.

THE historical transactions connected with the redemption of Israel from the land of Egypt, were not immediately succeeded by the introduction of that complicated form of symbolical worship, which peculiarly distinguishes the dispensation of Moses. There was an intermediate space occupied by revelations, which were in themselves of the greatest moment, and which also stood in a relation of closest intimacy with the symbolical religion that followed. The period we refer to is that to which belongs the giving of the law. And it is impossible to understand aright the nature of the tabernacle and its worship, or the purposes they were designed to accomplish, without first possessing a clear apprehension of this grand revelation of law, and the place it was intended to hold in the Mosaic dispensation.

What precisely formed this revelation of law, and what was the nature of its requirements? This must be our first subject of inquiry; and by a careful investigation of the points connected with it, we hope to avoid some prolific sources of confusion and error, and prepare the way for a correct understanding of the dispensation as a whole, and the proper adjustment of its several parts.

I. There can be no doubt that the word *law* is used both in the Old and the New Testament Scriptures with some latitude, and that what is meant by "the law" in one place, is sometimes considerably different from what is meant by it in another. It is used to designate indifferently precepts and appointed observances of all sorts, as well as the books in which they are enjoined. This only implies, however, that the things commanded by Moses had so much in common, that they might be all comprehended in one general term. It by no means hinders, that the law of the ten commandments may have been what was to be regarded as properly

and distinctively *the law* to Israel, and what, as such, was to hold a place in the dispensation peculiarly its own. That this in reality was the case we are fully satisfied, and submit the following considerations in proof of it.

1. The very manner in which these commandments were delivered, is sufficient to vindicate for them a peculiar and pre-eminent place. For these alone, of all the precepts which form the Mosaic code, were spoken immediately by the voice of God; while the rest were privately communicated to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. Nor were they simply proclaimed by God himself in the hearing of all the people, but that amidst demonstrations of divine majesty, such as were never witnessed on any other occasion. So awfully grand and magnificent was the scene, and so overwhelming the impression produced by it, that the people, we are told, could not endure the sight, and Moses himself exceedingly feared and quaked. That this unparalleled display of the terrible majesty and splendour of Heaven should have been given in connexion with precisely these ten commandments, plainly stamps them with a character and bearing which belonged only to themselves.

2. The same also may be inferred from their number—ten, the symbol of completeness; indicating that they formed by themselves an entire whole, made up of the necessary, and no more than the necessary complement of parts. A good deal of what is fanciful, or at least of what is incapable of any solid proof, has, in our apprehension, been advanced by recent writers, especially by Baehr, regarding the symbolical import of numbers. But there are some points, which may be considered as having been thoroughly ascertained respecting them; and what has just been affirmed of the number ten, may undoubtedly be ranked as one of these. The ascribing of such an import to this number, appears to have been of very ancient origin; for traces are to be found of it in the earliest and most distant nations; and even Spencer, who never admits a symbol where he can possibly avoid it, is constrained to allow a symbolical import here.* "The ten," to use the words of Baehr,† "by virtue of the general laws of thought shuts up the series of primary numbers, and comprehends all in itself. Now, since the whole numeral system consists of so many decades (tens,) and the first decade is the type of this endlessly repeating series, the nature of number in general is in this last fully developed, and the entire course comprised in its idea. Hence the number ten is the representative of the whole numeral system. And as number is employed to symbolize being in general, ten must denote the complete perfect being, that is, a number of particulars necessarily connected together, and combined into one whole. So that

* De Legib. Heb. iii. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matth. xxv. 1: Numero denario gavisa plurimum est gens Judaica et in sacris et in civilibus. But see the proof fully given in Baehr, Symb. i. p. 175 ss. Among other ancient authorities he produces the following: Etymol. Mgn. s. v. δεκας· 'η 'εχουσα 'εν αυτη παντα αριθμον. Cyrill. in Hos. iii.: συμβολον δε τελειοτητος 'ο δεκα ιστιν αριθμος, παντελειος 'ων. Herm. Trismeg. Poemand. 13: 'η ενας ουν κατα λογον την δεκαδα 'εχει και 'η δεκας τεν 'εναδα.

† Symbolik, i. p. 175.

ten is the symbol of perfection and completeness itself—a determinate whole, to which nothing is wanting." It is on account of this symbolical import of the number ten, that the plagues of Egypt were precisely of that number—forming as such a complete round of judgments; and, for the same reason, that the transgressions of the people in the wilderness were allowed to run on simply till they had reached that limit—when they had "sinned ten times," they had filled up the measure of their iniquities (Numb. xiv. 22.) Hence also the consecration of the tenths or tithes, which had grown into an established usage so early as the days of Abraham—the whole increase being represented by ten, and one of these set apart to the Lord in token of all being derived from him and held of him. So this revelation of law from Sinai, which was to serve for all coming ages as the grand expression of God's holiness, and the summation of man's duty, was comprised in the number ten, to indicate its perfection as one complete and comprehensive whole—"the all that a divinely called people, as well as a single individual, should and should not do in reference to God and their neighbour."*

3. It perfectly accords with this view of the ten commandments, and is a farther confirmation of the same, that they were written by the finger of God on two tables of stone,—written on both sides, so as to cover the entire surface, and not leave room for future additions, as if what was already given might admit of improvements, and written on durable tables of stone, while the rest of the law was written only on parchment or paper. It was for no lack of writing materials, as Hengstenberg has fully shown,† that in this and other cases, the engraving of letters upon stones was used in that remote period; for materials in great abundance existed in Egypt and its neighbourhood, and are known to have been used from the earliest times in the papyrus, the byssus-manufacture, and the skins of beasts. "The stone," he justly remarks, "points to the perpetuity which belongs to the law as an expression of the divine will, originating in the divine nature. It was an image of the truth uttered by our Lord, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.'"

4. Then, these ten words, as they are called, had the singular honour conferred on them of being properly the terms of the covenant formed at Sinai. Thus Moses, when rehearsing what had taken place, says, Deut. iv. 13, "And he declared to you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Again, in ch. ix. 9, 11, he calls these tables of stone "the tables of the covenant." So also in Ex. xxxiv. 28, "the words written upon the

* Sack's Apologetik, p. 180. As further examples of the Scriptural import of *ten*, we might have mentioned the ten men in Zechariah laying hold of the skirt of a Jew, ch. viii. 23, the parable of the ten virgins, and the ten horns or kingdoms in Revelation.

† Authentie, i. p. 481 ss. Also Buddeus, Hist. Eccl. i. p. 606: Argumento vero id etiam erat, perennem istam legem esse atque perpetuam, &c.

tables, the ten commandments," are expressly called "the words of the covenant." It is true, some other commands are recorded in the preceding context; and in the verse immediately preceding the Lord said to Moses that "after the tenor of (at the mouth of, according to) these words he had made a covenant with Israel." It is true, also, that at the formal ratification of the covenant, Ex. xxiv., we read of *the book of the covenant*, which comprehended not only the ten commandments, but also the precepts contained in ch. xxi.—xxiii.; for it is clear that this book comprised all that the Lord had then said either directly or by the instrumentality of Moses, and to which the people answered, "we will do it." But it is carefully to be observed that a marked distinction is still put between the ten commandments and the other precepts; for the former are called emphatically "the words of the Lord," while the additional words given through Moses are called "the judgments,"—(v. 3.) They are, indeed, peculiarly rights or judgments, having respect for the most part to the conduct between man and man, and what in the event of this not being what the law required, behooved to be done judicially with the view of rectifying or checking the evil. Their chief object was to secure, through the instrumentality of the magistrate, that if the proper *love* should fail to influence the hearts and lives of the people, still the *right* should be maintained. Yet while these form the great body of the additional words communicated to Moses and written in the book of the covenant, the symbolical institutions had also a certain place assigned them; for both in ch. xxiii., and again in ch. xxxiv., the three yearly feasts and one or two other points of this description are noticed. But still these directions and judgments formed no proper addition to the matter of the ten commandments, considered as God's revelation of law to his people; the terms of the covenant still resolved themselves, as we are expressly and repeatedly told, into the ten commandments; and what, besides, was added before the ratification of the covenant, could not possibly have had any other object in view, in so far as they partook of the nature of laws, which the feasts very imperfectly did, than to help as means in securing the observance of the covenant. Had there been no predisposition to violate the covenant, there had been no need for any additional prescriptions connected with it. But of this more hereafter.

5. What has been just said in regard to the ten commandments alone properly constituting the terms of the covenant, is fully established, and the singular importance of these commandments further manifested, by the place afterwards assigned them in the tabernacle. The most sacred and important part of this, and the very heart and centre of all the services connected with it, was the ark of the covenant, which was the peculiar symbol of the Lord's covenant presence and faithfulness, and the lid of which was, in a manner, the very throne on which he sat as king in Jeshurun. But that ark was simply made to contain the two tables of the law, and was therefore called "the ark of the covenant," because it contained "the tables of the covenant." The book of the law

was afterwards placed by Moses at the side of the ark, (Deut. xxxi. 26,) but that merely as a check upon the Levites, who were the proper guardians and keepers of the book, a wise precaution lest they should prove unfaithful to their charge. The tables on which the ten commandments were written alone kept possession of the ark, and were thus plainly recognised as containing in themselves the perfect delineation of all covenant obligation and duty.

6. Finally, our Lord and his apostles always point to the revelation of law engraven upon these stones, as holding a pre-eminent place, and, indeed, as comprising all that in the strict and proper sense was to be esteemed as law. The scribes and Pharisees of that age had completely inverted the order of things; their carnality and self-righteousness had led them to exalt the precepts respecting ceremonial observances to the highest place, and to throw the duties inculcated in the ten commandments comparatively into the back-ground—thus treating the mere appendages of the covenant as of more account than its very ground and basis. Hence, when seeking to expose the insufficient and hollow nature of "the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees," our Lord made his appeal to the testimony engraved on the two tables, and most commonly, indeed, though not exclusively, to the precepts of the second table, because there the shortcoming had most palpably discovered itself, and in that direction he could most readily awaken convictions of sin, (Matth. xix. 16; Luke x. 25; xviii. 18, &c.) In such cases, as Calvin justly remarks, "Christ speaks of those works by which a man ought to approve himself as just. The obedience of the first table consisted almost entirely either in the internal affection of the heart, or in ceremonies. The affection of the heart was not visible, and hypocrites were diligent in the observance of ceremonies; but the works of charity were of such a nature as to be a solid attestation of righteousness."* For the same reason, Christ's sermon on the mount, which was chiefly intended to be an exposition of the real nature and far-reaching import of the ten commandments, bears most respect to those commandments which belonged to the second table, and which had suffered most from the corruption of the times. But the prophets of the Old Testament had done precisely the same thing in reproving the ungodliness prevalent in their day; they ever appear striving to recall men from the mere outward observances which the most worthless hypocrites could perform, to the sincere piety toward God, and deeds of substantial kindness toward man, required by the law of the two tables; so that the prophets, as well as the law, were truly said to hang upon one and the same commandment of love.† In like manner, the Apostle Paul, after Christ, as the prophets, before, when discoursing in regard to the

* Inst. B. ii. c. 8, § 52.

† See especially Ps. xv. xxiv., which describe the righteousness required under the covenant, by obedience to the ten commandments, and more particularly to those of the second table—specially designed, no doubt, to meet the tendency which the more attractive and orderly celebration then introduced into God's service was fitted to awaken; see also Ps. xl. l. li.; Isa. i. lvii., &c., Micah vi.

law, what it was or was not, what it could or could not do, always has in view pre-eminently the law of the two tables; without an exception his examples are taken from the very words of these, or what they clearly prohibited and required, (Rom. ii. 17—23; iii. 10—18; vii. 7; xiii. 9, 10; 1 Tim. i. 7—10.) This, of course, does not exactly apply to the argument maintained in the epistles to the Galatians and Colossians, where the error met and opposed consisted in an undue exaltation of the ceremonial institutions by themselves, as if the observance of them by the Christian church were essential to salvation. In this case, he could not possibly avoid referring chiefly to the precepts of a ceremonial nature, and dealing with these on the ground on which they were improperly put by certain parties in the primitive church. But when the question was, what the law in its strict and proper sense really required, and what were the ends it was fitted to serve, he never fails to manifest his concurrence with the other inspired writers in taking the ten words as the law and the testimony, by which every thing was to be judged and determined.

We should despair of proving any thing respecting the Old Testament dispensation, if these considerations do not conclusively manifest the law of the ten commandments to have stood out from all the other precepts enjoined under the ministration of Moses, and to have been properly and peculiarly the law or covenant to Israel. No doubt, many of the other precepts teach substantially what these commandments did, or contain statements and regulations bearing some way upon them. But this was not done with a view of supplying any new or additional matter of obligation; it was merely intended to explain their real import, or to give instructions how to adapt to them what might be called the jurisprudence of the state. We cannot but regard it as an unhappy circumstance, tending to perpetuate much misunderstanding and confusion regarding the legislation of Moses, that the distinction has been practically overlooked, which it so manifestly assigns to the ten commandments, and that they have almost universally been regarded by the more learned theologians as the kind of quintessence of the whole Mosaic code, as the few general or representative heads under which all the rest may be ranged. Thus Calvin, while he held the ten commandments to be a perfect rule of righteousness, and gave for the most part a correct, as well as admirable exposition of their tenor and design, yet failed to bring out distinctly their singular and prominent place in the Mosaic economy, and in his commentary reduces all the ceremonial institutions to one or other of these ten commandments. Hence, they were regarded by him as standing to the entire law of Moses in the relation of primary elements or heads. And hence, also, there may have been, as he indeed partially admits there was, something shadowy in the one as well as in the other. But what was chiefly a defect of arrangement in Calvin and many subsequent writers, has in Baehr become consolidated into a formal principle, and is laid as the foundation of his view of the whole Mosaic

system. "The decalogue is representative of the whole law; it contains religious and political, not less than moral precepts. The first command is a purely religious one; as is also the fourth, which belongs to the ceremonial law; and, indeed, generally by reason of the theocratical constitution, all civil commands were at the same time religious and moral ones, and inversely; so that the old division into moral, ceremonial, and political or judicial, appears quite untenable."* On this point he even quotes Spencer with approbation, who considered all the different classes of precepts to be exhibited in the decalogue as on a small tablet, or in a brief compend. And both from the references of Baehr, and from our own reading, we should suppose this to be the view adopted by nearly all the continental divines, evangelical, as well as rational. The mischievous consequences involved in it will appear in the course of our remarks upon some parts of the decalogue itself, and also afterwards when unfolding the relation of the decalogue to the ceremonial institutions. It is such an error as confounds the means of salvation with the great principles of religious and moral obligation, and leaves, if followed out, no solid basis for the doctrine of a vicarious atonement to rest on. With perfect consistence, Baehr constructs his system without the help of such an atonement.

II. We proceed now to consider the excellence of this law of the ten commandments, and to show, by an examination of its method and substance, how justly it was regarded as a complete and perfect summary of religious and moral duty.

It is scarcely possible, even at this stage of the world's history, to consider with any care the words of this law, without in some measure apprehending its high character as a standard of rectitude. And could we throw ourselves back to the time when it was first promulgated,—could we, instead of looking at it, as we now do, from the high ground of a clearer and more perfect revelation, distinctly realize its position, as given seventeen centuries before the Christian era, and received as the foundation of all truth and duty among a people who had just left the polluted atmosphere of Egypt, we could not fail to discern, in the very existence of such a law, one of the most striking proofs of the divine character of the Mosaic legislation. We should be much more disposed to exclaim here, than in regard to the outward prodigy, which first called forth the declaration, "This is the finger of God."

* Symbolik, I. p. 384. He elsewhere, p. 181, seeks to justify this view from the number *ten*, in which the law was contained; and which number he considers to have been employed in the promulgation of this law, because "it was the fundamental law of Israel, in a religious and political respect, the representative of the whole Israelitish constitution." We hold this to be a most arbitrary interpretation, having nothing to justify it in the law itself, and substantially disproved by every one of the considerations adduced above, for the peculiar position of the decalogue. We conceive it also to be a departure from his own view of the symbolical import of the *ten*—which he justly regards as indicating perfection and completeness; whereas, in attributing to the decalogue a representative value, and making it stand for the whole, he gives it the import of the *tenth*. If the whole law had been comprised in ten groups, and the decalogue had consisted of one from each group, we could then, but only then, have seen the force and justice of his interpretation.

A remarkable testimony was given to the general excellence of the decalogue, and its vast superiority as a code of morality, to any thing found among the native superstitions of the East, in the language of those Indians referred to by Dr. Claudius Buchanan: "If you send us a missionary, send us one who has learned your ten commandments."* If modern idolaters were thus taken with the divine beauty and singular preciousness of these commandments, we know those could have no less reason to be so to whom they were first delivered. For the land of Egypt, out of which they had recently escaped, was the grand seat of ancient superstition, as well as of ancient learning and civilization. As far back as our information respecting it carries us, at a period certainly more remote than that in which Israel sojourned within its borders, the Egyptians appear to have been immersed in the deepest mire of idolatry and its kindred abominations; and on them peculiarly was chargeable the guilt and folly of "having changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." Not satisfied even with this wide range of image-worship, they multiplied to themselves idols of monstrous forms, as in their debased apprehensions fit symbols, through which to contemplate and adore the objects of their worship. And the kind of worship they paid their idol-gods, it is now ascertained, was connected with the foulest pollutions and most vicious excesses. There are not wanting indications of this in Herodotus, and several allusions are also made to it in the Books of Moses. But one of the most profound inquirers into the religion of the ancients, has recently shown, on evidence the most complete, that the worship of ancient Egypt was essentially of a Bacchanalian character, full of lust and revelry; that its most frequented rites were accompanied with scenes of wantonness and impure indulgence; and that it sometimes gave rise to enormities not fit to be mentioned.†

Such was the atmosphere in which the Israelites had lived during their abode in Egypt; and it was when fresh from such a region, that the law of the ten commandments was proclaimed in their hearing, and laid as the foundation of their entire polity:—a law which unfolds the clearest views of God's character and service—which denounces every form and species of idolatry, as inconsistent with the spirituality of the divine nature—which enjoins the purest worship and the highest morality, and in its very form is a model of perfection and completeness. Wisdom of this kind Moses could least of all have learned from the Egyptians; nor could it have been his, unless it had descended to him from above.‡

* Essay on the Estab. of an Episcopal Church in India, p. 61.

† Creuzer, Symbolik, i. p. 448 ss., comp. also, Hengstenberg, Authentie, i. p. 118, ss.; Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 203 ss.

‡ It is one of the few correct things, which Tacitus states concerning the religion of the Jews, that they counted it profanity to make images in the likeness of man, and that they worshipped only one supreme, eternal, unchangeable, and everlasting God (Hist. v. 5.) It would be difficult, however, to throw together a larger amount of ignorance and error in the same space, than is expressed in this and the preceding chapter, by Tacitus, respecting the religious customs and rites of the Jews.

1. Let us look, first, to the perfection manifested in the beautiful order and arrangement of these commandments. They were written on two tables, and fall into two grand divisions corresponding to these, the first comprehending our duty to God, and the second our duty to man. This is admitted on all hands, though there is some diversity of opinion where the one terminates and the other begins. Discarding the view adopted by the Roman Catholic, and most Lutheran divines, which, by arbitrarily throwing the first two commandments into one, and splitting the last into two, places only three in the first table and seven in the last, the division most commonly adopted by Protestant divines, is that of four in the first and six in the second table. Yet this division does not appear to accord with the significance manifestly attached to the number *ten*, in which the whole are comprised, and which, in the case of a division into two great parts, we might naturally have expected to fall into two fives—two equal, incomplete halves. This also is what Josephus testifies to have been done, for he affirms that there were "five commandments upon each table, and two and a half upon each side of them."* We are certainly not disposed to regard his testimony as by any means conclusive; but it is so far entitled to weight, as expressing the current opinion, or general tradition of his countrymen; and a more careful consideration of the nature of the fifth commandment will be found to vindicate its title to a place in the first rather than in the second table. For if the sum of the second table be, "Love thy neighbour as thyself," as is clearly implied in both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures (Lev. xix. 18; Matt. xx. 39,) the command to honour parents can scarcely with propriety be included in it, as they do not stand on a footing of equality, in the relation of "a neighbour," strictly so called. They are rather, according to the scriptural view, to be regarded as representatives of God, to whom he delegates a portion of his authority, and for whom he consequently exacts a portion of the honour due to himself. Hence, the apostle Paul directs, that children should be taught "to show *piety* at home, and to requite their parents"—thus making filial reverence and dutiful regard to parents of the essence of religion. "The fifth commandment," says Baumgarten, excellently, "enjoins the honouring of parents; but Jehovah alone is entitled to honour, and a man as such has no honour before others as such. If, however, the word here is of an obligation to give honour to men, this is what they could only have from God. Parents are therefore regarded as those whom God appoints to receive honour from their children. Nor is there any difficulty in understanding how it should be so; for the creative power of God, on which all life depends, is communicated to the children through their parents; so that God, as the creator of life, appears to the children primarily in the parents, as the earthly divinities, (the diis terrestribus,) to use the language of Grotius. We can thus readily explain, why the command to honour parents has been assigned to the first half of the ten words, which expressly refers

* Ant. B. III. c. 6, § 5.

to Jehovah, as we also find in each one of those first five words the designation, 'The Lord thy God.' But since the relation between parents and children is the basis of all the divinely constituted relations of human society, which involve stations of superiority and inferiority, as the names also of father and mother have been made to stretch over the whole natural circle (Gen. xlv. 8; Judg. v. 7,) it is certainly in the spirit of the law to explain this command, with Luther, in reference to the sphere of the civil life. Now, to this command, as Paul specially notices, Eph. vi. 2, is attached a promise, as being properly the first, and therefore the only one, that has a promise bound up with it. For the promise at the second is only to be regarded as an appendage to the threatening which precedes, and stands in immediate connexion with the prohibition. But that the command is here first coupled with a determinate promise, arises from the circumstance, that in this word the honouring of God is first brought out into the circle of the natural life, to which the Old Testament with its promises every where primarily refers."*

These considerations are amply sufficient to remove Calvin's objection to this view, as "confounding the distinction between piety and charity."† And it might be farther confirmed by pointing to the close connexion established in other parts of the books of Moses, between God and the constituted authorities in the land, as if the one were in a sense identical with the other. Thus, in Deut. xix. 17, we find it ordained, that the men at strife with each other, should "stand before the Lord, before the priests and the judges;" and in Ex. xxi., 6, the master of a servant is directed, in certain circumstances, to "bring him unto the judges," as it is in our version, but literally, unto God—the authority of the judges being regarded as that of God. So, again, in Ex. xxii. 8; and in v. 27, it is said, "Thou shalt not revile God, (not gods, as in our version,) nor curse the ruler of thy people"—where the visible representative of God is coupled with God himself, and the offence committed against the one is held to be a dishonour done to the other. It is precisely in the same way, that the honouring of parents is placed among the things due to God himself. And

* Commentar. ii. pp. 12, 13. This last thought, which the learned author goes on to amplify, scarcely touches the exact bearing, we think, of the promise. It has respect rather to continuance in the land, than to the possession of life—"that thy days may be long upon the land"—that thou mayest continue long in the enjoyment of what God promised to thy fathers. It is just the great blessing of the covenant—the inheritance, which is appended by way of promise to this fifth commandment; and appended to it, we conceive, on this account especially, because it is with the authority of God as delegated to these earthly heads, that we come first and most directly into contact; and in them also it is associated with so much that is fitted to win and captivate the heart, that here peculiarly it may be said, "If we do not love (so as to obey) those whom we have seen, how can we love God, whom we have not seen?" The Lord hung their whole interest in the inheritance on the due fulfilment of the duties growing out of the parental relation, in the confidence that if these were neglected, nothing connected with his glory would be rightly attended to. According to this view, "a promise of long life and prosperity," hardly comes up to the full import of the encouragement, either for Old or New Testament times.—The division of the two tables into two fives, has also been espoused by Hengstenberg, Authentie, II. p. 605, and others on the continent.

† Inst. B. II. c. viii. § 12.

by this arrangement we discover a beautiful order and gradation in the successive commands of the first table: Give God the honour and glory due to him, 1. In regard to his Being, as the one living God; 2. to his worship; 3. to his name, or the outward manifestations he gives of himself; 4. to his day of rest; 5. to his representatives. Nor is it unworthy of notice to mark the gradual merging of the duties of the one table into those of the other—observable first, in the fourth commandment, which carries a special respect to the condition of servants, and demands their release from ordinary labour every seventh day—but again, and more especially in the fifth, which has respect to men—to men, indeed, as God's representatives, and as such, clothed with a portion of that authority which properly belongs only to him—but still in such a sense to men, that the transition appears most natural and easy, from such honour paid to God in them, to the kind and upright behaviour due from one man to another, in the ordinary intercourse of life.

The wisdom manifested, however, in the order and arrangement of the decalogue, not only appears in the contents of the two tables, but also in the relative position of these tables themselves—the first comprising the duties we owe to God, and the second those we owe to men. The outgoings and manifestations of love to God, in the first rank of duties, and then, in a secondary place, but still in very close connexion with the other, those expressive of love to man. Here, as well as in the gospel, religion was made the foundation and root of morality. We must first stand, it was in a manner declared, in a becoming relation to God, and be rightly affectioned toward him, otherwise it will be vain to expect that we shall act our part aright toward our fellow-creatures. If our hearts have not come into fellowship and harmony with the great Head of the family, it is impossible, in the nature of things, that we should feel and act as brethren toward its members. And the principle of obedience to him must ever be, as Augustine has well expressed it, "the parent, in a manner, and guardian of all the virtues."*

There may, no doubt, be some measure of love and kindness between man and man, where there is no love, but only deep and rooted enmity toward God. Were it not so, society in irreligious countries would fall to pieces. But, in such cases, there can be no love of the right kind—no love to men as the offspring of the Creator, made in his image; nor can it exist in the proper degree, but must, in many respects, be partial, defective, and erring in its manifestations. It was, therefore, in consistence with the highest wisdom, that the things which belong to God should in this grand summary of duty be exalted to the first place; and in farther demonstration of their pre-eminent rank and importance, it is to the commands of this table, and to these alone, that there are attached special reasons for God's exacting and man's giving the obedience required. The five commands of the second table are all of them simple and brief enunciations of the will of God as to the path of duty.

* De Civ. Dei, L. xiv. c. 11. Mater quodammodo est omnium custosque virtutum.

2. It is of more importance, however, to have a correct view of the perfection of the decalogue as to the summary of duty contained in it. Does it prove itself, indeed, on examination, to be a full and comprehensive statement of all obligation of duty toward God and man? and that with respect to the heart, as well as the outward walk and conduct?

An extremely low estimate is formed in this respect of the ten commandments by Spencer and his school, as well as of the other portions of the law of Moses. Spencer himself smiles at the idea of all religious and moral obligation being contained here in its fundamental principles, and affirms that such an extent of meaning can be brought out of it only by forcing on its words an import quite foreign to their proper sense. He can find nothing more in it than a few plain and disconnected precepts, aimed at the prohibition of idolatry and its natural effects.* "In the Mosaic covenant," says one of Spencer's followers, "God appeared chiefly as a temporal prince, and therefore gave laws intended rather to direct the outward conduct, than to regulate the actings of the heart. A temporal monarch claims from his subjects only outward honour and obedience. God, therefore, acting in the Sinai covenant as king of the Jews, demanded from them no more."† What! the living and eternal God stoop to form such a mock-covenant as this, and resort to such a wretched expedient to uphold his honour and authority! He come down from heaven, and with the highest display of his magnificence and glory proclaim the terms of a covenant, the only aim of which was to draw around him a set of formal attendants and crouching hypocrites—men of show and parade—the mere ghosts and shadows of obedient children! It is the worst part of an earthly monarch's lot to be so often surrounded with creatures of this description; but to suppose that the living God, who from the spirituality of his nature must ever look mainly on the heart, and so far from seeking, must positively abhor any homage or obedience which does not come from the heart—to suppose that he should have actually entered into a covenant of blood to secure such a worthless display, betrays an astonishing misapprehension of the character of God, and the most shallow and unsatisfactory view of the whole transactions connected with the revelation of Moses.

Indeed, if no more had been required by God in his law than what these divines imagine, the commendations bestowed on it, and the injunctions given to study and weigh its precepts, as a master-piece of divine wisdom, could only be regarded as extravagant and bombastical. What, on such a supposition, could we make of the command laid upon Joshua to meditate in it day and night (Josh. i. 8,) or of the celebration of its matchless excellence and worth by the Psalmist, as better than thousands of gold and

* De Legibus Heb. L. I. c. 2.

† Theol. Dissertations by Dr. John Erskine, p. 5, 37. When we characterize him as a follower of Spencer, we mean of course only on the subject of the Mosaic legislation. On other subjects he belonged to a different school.

silver, (Ps. xix.,) or of his prayer, that his eyes might be opened to behold the wondrous things contained in it? (Ps. cxix. 18.) Such things clearly imply a great depth of meaning, and a vast breadth of requirement in the law of Moses, and pre-eminently in that part of it which formed the very heart and centre of the whole, the decalogue. Nor would the low and shallow views respecting it, on which we have animadverted, ever have been propounded, if, as Calvin suggests,* men properly considered the Lawgiver, by whose character that of the law must also be determined. An earthly monarch who is capable of taking cognizance only of the outward actions, must prescribe laws which have respect simply to these. But, for a like reason, the King of heaven, who is himself a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, can never prescribe a law but such as is spiritual, and has respect peculiarly to the thoughts and affections of the heart,—to the outward behaviour no farther than this may be expressive of what is felt within. And it is justly inferred by Baehr from this view of God's character even in regard to the ceremonial part of the law of Moses, that the outward observances of worship it imposed could not possibly be in themselves an end; that they must have been intended to be only an image and representation of internal and spiritual relations; and that the command not to make any likeness or graven image is of itself an incontestable proof of the symbolical character of the Mosaic religion.†

Perhaps nothing has tended more to prevent the right perception of the spirituality and extent of the law of the ten commandments, than a mistaken view of the prevailingly negative tone of the precepts, as if they were simply to be regarded as restraints against the doing of what is formally prohibited. If this, however, were the right view of the matter, there manifestly would have been no exception to the negative form of the precepts; they would all have possessed the character merely of prohibitions. But the fourth and fifth have been made to run in the positive form, and one of these, the fourth, in both the negative and positive form, to render it manifest, that along with the prohibition of the specified sins, each precept was to be understood as requiring the corresponding duties. In truth this predominantly negative character is rather a testimony to their deep spiritual import, as opposing at every point the depravity and sinfulness of the human heart. The Israelites then, as professing believers now, admitted by sovereign grace into a covenant-standing with God, and received to an interest in his inheritance, should have been disposed of themselves to love and serve God; they should not even have needed the strict constraint and binding obligations of law to do so. But as a solemn proof and testimony how much the reverse was the case, the law was thrown chiefly into the prohibitory form: "Thou shalt not do so and so;" as much as to say, thou art of thyself ready to do it—this is the native bent of thy inclination—but it

* Institutes, B. II. c. 8, § 6. † Symbolik, I. p. 14.

must be restrained, and things directly opposite sought after and performed.

It was precisely on this account, as Hengstenberg has conclusively shown in opposition to Baehr, that the law in general, and pre-eminently the law of the ten words, was called the *testimony*. This, in the language of the books of Moses, does not mean simply that they testified of God's mind and will, or constituted the revelation he was pleased to give of man's duty; but a testimony containing such a revelation of his holiness as at the same time brought to light the sins of his people—his witness against the depravity and corruption of the human heart. Hence, when the law or any part of it is spoken of as a testimony, it is usually coupled with the accessory idea of a conviction of evil—a witnessing against them for transgressions committed, (Deut. xxxi. 19, 26, 27; Josh. xxiv. 22.) And hence also, as the Lord's testimony against his people's sinfulness, it was placed under the covering of the mercy-seat, and is once and again mentioned in that connexion—such a symbolical covering being necessary to render it possible for the righteous Jehovah to meet on terms of peace and friendship with those against whom his law was ever reporting, in a manner, such heavy tidings in his ears, (Ex. xxv. 21, 22, xxvi. 34; Lev. xvi. 13.*) So that this law was of so pure and searching a nature, that its first effect upon the conscience was necessarily, like the work of the Spirit, "to convince of sin." And the impress of this it bore upon the very form of its precepts.

The more closely we examine these precepts themselves, the more clearly do we perceive their spiritual and comprehensive character. That they recognise love as the root of all obedience, and hatred as the root of all transgression, is plainly intimated in the description given of the doers and transgressors of the law in the second commandment; the latter being characterized as "those that hate me," and the former as "those that love me and keep my commandments." And that the love required was no shallow and superficial principle, finding its development only in a few easy, external acts, that on the contrary it embraced the entire field of man's spiritual agency, and bore respect alike to his thoughts, words, and deeds, is manifest from the following analysis of the second table, which we present in the words of another:† "Thou shalt not injure thy neighbour, 1. in deed, and that (1) not in regard to his life, (2) not in regard to his dearest property, his wife, (3) not in regard to his property generally. 2. In word, ("Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.") 3. In thought, ("Thou shalt not covet."). . .While it may be admitted, however, that the prohibition of lust, or covetousness has an internal character, it may still with some plausibility be maintained that on this very account the preceding commands are to be taken

* Authentie, II. p. 598, 640, comp. Baehr's Symbolik, I. p. 83, ss.

† Hengstenberg, Authentie, ii. p. 600. Substantially the same analysis was made by Thomas Aquinas, in a short but very clear quotation given there by the author from his Summa, i. 2, q. 100, § 5.

externally—that we are not in them to go beyond the word and deed—that the mere outward acts, for example, of murder and adultery, are prohibited, so that the first four precepts of the second table may be satisfied without any inward feeling of holiness, this being required only in the last. There is certainly some degree of truth in this remark. That a special prohibition of sinful lust should follow the rest, shows that what had been said in reference to word and deed, *primarily* has respect to these. Still, it must not be overlooked, on the other hand, that precisely through the succession of deed, word, and thought, the deed and thought are stript of their merely outward character, and referred back to their root in the mind, are marked simply as the end of a process, the commencement of which is to be sought in the heart. If this is duly considered, it will appear, that what primarily refers only to word and deed, carried at the same time an indirect reference to the emotions of the heart. Thus, the only way to fulfil the command, "Thou shalt not kill," is to have the root extirpated from the heart, out of which murder springs. Where that is not done, the command is not fully complied with, even though no outward murder is committed. For this must then be dependent upon circumstances, which lie beyond the circle of man's proper agency."

There is no less depth and comprehensiveness in the first table, as the same learned writer has remarked, and a similar regard is had in it to thought, word, and deed, only in the reverse order, and lying somewhat less upon the surface. The fourth and fifth precepts demand the due honouring of God in deed; the third in word; and the first two, pointing to his sole Godhead and absolute spirituality, require for himself personally, and for his worship, that place in the heart to which they are entitled. So that the heart may truly be called the alpha and the omega of this wonderful revelation of law; it stands prominently forth at both ends; and, had no inspired commentary been given on the full import of the ten words, looking merely to these words themselves, we cannot but perceive that they stretch their demands over the whole range of man's active operations, and can only be fulfilled by the constant and uninterrupted exercise of love to God and man, in the various regions of the heart, the conversation, and the conduct.

We *have* commentaries, however, both in the Old and the New Testament scriptures, upon the law of the ten commandments, and such as plainly confirm what has been said of its perfection and completeness as a rule of duty. With manifest reference to the second table, and with the view of expressing in one brief sentence the essence of its meaning, Moses had said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," (Lev. xix. 18;) and in like manner regarding the first table, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might," (Deut. vi. 5.) It is against all reason to suppose, that these precepts should require more than what was required in those which formed the very ground-work and heart of the whole Mosaic legislation. And we have the express authority of our Lord for holding, that the

whole law, as well as the prophets, hung upon them, (Matt. xxii. 40.) Nor only so, but as already noticed, in the Sermon on the Mount he has himself given us an insight into the wide reach and deep spiritual meaning of the ten commandments, clearing them from the false and superficial glosses of the carnal Pharisees. That this is the true character and design of that portion of our Lord's discourse, that it was intended to bring distinctly out the full import of the old, and not to introduce any new and higher legislation, is now generally admitted, by the sounder portion at least, of the continental divines.* And, to mention no more, the apostle Paul, referring to the law of the ten commandments, calls it "spiritual," "holy, just, and good,"—represents it as the grand instrument in the hands of the Spirit, for convincing of sin—and declares the only fulfilment of it to be perfect love, (Rom. vii. 7, 14, xiii. 10.)

In conclusion, we trust we have established the claim of the law of the ten commandments to be regarded in the light in which it has commonly been viewed by evangelical divines of this country, as a brief, but comprehensive, summary of all religious and moral duty. And as a necessary consequence, the two grand rules with which they have been wont to enter on the exposition of the decalogue, approve themselves as well-grounded. These rules are, 1. That the same precept which forbids the *external* acts of sin, forbids likewise the *inward* desires and motions of sin in the heart—as also that the precept which commands the external acts of duty, requires at the same time the inward feelings and principles of holiness, of which the former should only be the native expression. 2. That the negative commands include in them the injunction of the contrary duties, and the positive commands the prohibition of the contrary sins, so that in each there is something required, as well as forbidden.—Nor is the language too strong, if rightly understood, which has often been applied to this law, that it is a kind of transcript of God's own pure and righteous character; that is, a faithful and exact representation of that spiritual excellence, which eternally belongs to himself, and which he must eternally require of his accountable creatures. The idea which such language conveys is undoubtedly correct, if understood in reference to the great principles of truth and holiness embodied in the precepts, though but very imperfectly true in regard to the formal acts in which those principles were to find their prescribed manifestation. For the appointed outgoings of the principles had of necessity to be ordered in suitable adaptation to men's condition upon earth, to which, as there belong relations, so also relative duties, not only different from any thing with which God himself has properly to do, but different even from what his people shall have to discharge in a coming eternity. *There* such precepts as the fifth,

* Tholuck, indeed, as usual on such points, holds a sort of middle opinion here in his Comm. on the Sermon on the Mount, although he is substantially of the opinion expressed above, and opposed to the view of Catholic, Socinian, and Arminian writers. See, however, Baumgarten, Doc. Christi de Lege Mosaica in Oratione Mon., with whom also Hengstenberg concurs, loc. cit.

the sixth, the seventh, or the eighth, as to the formal acts they prohibit or require, shall manifestly have lost their adaptation. And of the whole law we may affirm, that the precise form it has assumed, or the mould into which it has been cast, is such as fitly suits it only to the circumstances of the present life. But the love to God and man, which constitutes its all-pervading element, and for which the several precepts only indicate the particular ways and channels it is outwardly to take, this love man is perpetually bound in all times and circumstances to cherish in his heart, and manifest in his conduct. For the God, in whom he lives, and moves, and has his being, is love; and as the duty and perfection of the creature is to bear the image of the Creator, so to love as he loves —himself first and supremely, and his offspring in him and for him, must ever be the bounden obligation and highest end of those whom he calls his children.

CHAPTER II.

THE LAW CONTINUED—APPARENT EXCEPTIONS TO ITS PERFECTION AND COMPLETENESS AS THE PERMANENT AND UNIVERSAL STANDARD OF RELIGIOUS AND MORAL OBLIGATION—THE REFERENCES IT EMBODIES TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE ISRAELITES, AND THE THREATENING, IN PARTICULAR, OF A VISITATION OF EVIL UPON THE CHILDREN FOR THE SINS OF THE PARENTS.

It is necessary to pause here for a short time, and enter into some examination of the objections which have been raised out of the ten commandments themselves, against the character of perfection and completeness which we have sought to establish for them. For if any doubt should remain on this point, it will most materially interfere with and mar the line of argument we mean afterwards to pursue, and the views we have to propound in connexion with this revelation of law to Israel.

By a certain class of writers, we are met at the very threshold with a species of objection, which they seem to regard as perfectly conclusive against its general completeness and universal obligation. For it contains special and distinct references to the Israelites as a people. The whole is prefaced with the declaration, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt," while the fifth commandment embodies in it the promise of the land of Canaan as their peculiar inheritance. And this, we are told, makes it clear as noon-day, that the decalogue was not given as a revelation of God's will to mankind at large, but was simply and exclusively intended for the Israelites—binding, indeed, on them, so long as the peculiar polity lasted, under which they were placed, but also ceasing as an obligatory rule of conduct when that was

abolished.* But, on this ground, the gospel itself will be found scarcely less imperfect, and we might almost at every step question the fitness or obligation of its precepts in respect to men in general. For it carries throughout a reference to existing circumstances, and by much the fullest development of its principles and duties, that contained in the epistles, was given directly and avowedly to particular persons and churches, with the primary design of instructing them in the will of God. So that if the specialities found in the law of the two tables were sufficient to exempt men *now* from its obligation, or to deprive it at any time of an œcumenical value, most of the revelations of the gospel might, for the same reason, be shorn of their virtue, and in both alike, men would be entitled to pick and choose for themselves what they were to regard as of universal moment and perpetual obligation.

But what egregious trifling is this? The objection overlooks one of the most distinctive features, and, indeed, one of the greatest excellencies of God's revelation, which at no period was given in the form of abstract delineations of truth and duty, but has ever developed itself in immediate connexion with the circumstances of individuals and the issues of providence. From first to last it comes forth entwined with the characters and events of history. Not a little of it is written in the transactions themselves of past time, which are expressly declared to have been "written for *our* learning." And it is equally true of the law and the gospel, that the historical lines, with which they are interwoven, while serving to increase their interest and enhance their instructive value, by no means detract from their general bearing, or interfere with their binding obligation. The ground of this lies in the unchangeableness of God's character, which may be said to generalize all that is particular in his revelation, and impart a lasting efficacy to what was but occasional in its origin. Without variableness or shadow of turning in himself, he cannot have a word for one, and a different word for another. And unless the things spoken and required were so manifestly peculiar as to be applicable only to the individuals to whom they were first addressed, or from their very nature possessed a merely temporary significance, we must hold them to be the revelation of God's mind and will for all persons and all times.

That the Lord uttered this law to Israel in the character of their Redeemer, and imposed it on them as the heirs of his inheritance, made no alteration in its own inherent nature; neither contracted nor enlarged the range of its obligation; only established

* Bialloblotzky, de Legis Mos. abrogatione, p. 131; Archb. Whateley also repeats the same objection, in his Essay on the abolition of the law, p. 186 (Second Series of Essays.) The view of both these authors, which is radically the same, regarding the abolition of the law under the Christian economy, we shall have occasion to notice afterwards. The affirmation of the Archbishop, at p. 191, that "the gospel requires a morality in many respects higher and more perfect in itself than the law, and places morality on higher grounds," has already been met in the preceding chapter; and we may safely leave it to the Archbishop himself to tell us what higher morality than love, regulating every thought, word, and deed, either has been or can be prescribed; and what higher ground any creature can occupy than that.

its claim on *their* observance, by considerations peculiarly fitted to move and influence their minds. Christ's enforcing upon his disciples the lesson of humility, by his own condescension in stooping to wash their feet, or Paul's entreating his Gentile converts to walk worthy of their vocation, by the thought of his being, for their sakes, the prisoner of the Lord, are not materially different. The special considerations, coupled in either case alike with the precept enjoined, leave perfectly untouched the ground of the obligation or the rule of duty. Their proper and legitimate effect was only to win obedience, or, failing that, to aggravate transgression. And when the things required are such as those enjoined in the ten commandments—things growing out of the settled relations in which men stand to God and to each other, the obligation to obey is universal and permanent, whether or not there be any considerations of the kind in question, tending to render obedience more imperative, or transgression more heinous.

But what if some of the considerations employed to enforce the observance of the duties enjoined, involve views of the divine character and government partial and defective, at variance with the principles of the Gospel, and repulsive even to enlightened reason? Can that really have been meant to be of standing force and efficacy as a revelation of duty, which embodies in it such elements of imperfection? Such is the form the objection takes in the hands of another large class of objectors, who think they find matter of the kind referred to in the declarations attached to the second commandment. The view there given of God as a *jealous* being, and of the manner in which his jealousy was to express itself, has by some been represented as so peculiarly Jewish, by others as so flagrantly obnoxious to right principle, that they denounce the very thought of the decalogue being considered as a perfect revelation of the mind and will of God. The subject has long afforded a favourite ground of railing accusation to avowed infidels and rationalist divines; and Spinosa could not think of any thing in Scripture more clearly and manifestly repugnant to reason, than that the attribute of jealousy was ascribed to God in the decalogue itself.

The treatment which this article in the decalogue has met with, is a good specimen of the shallow and superficial character of infidelity. It proceeds on the supposition that jealousy, when ascribed to God, must carry precisely the same meaning, and be understood to indicate the same affections, as when spoken of men. Considered as a dispensation in man, it is commonly indicative of something sickly and distempered. But as every affection of the human mind must, when referred to God, be understood with such limitations as the infinite disparity between the divine and human natures renders necessary, it might be no difficult matter to modify the common notion of jealousy, so far as to render it perfectly compatible with the other representations given of God as perfect in holiness. But even this is scarcely necessary; for every scholar knows that the word in the original is by no means restricted

to what is distinctively meant by jealousy, and that the radical and proper idea, unless otherwise determined by the context, has respect merely to the *zeal* or ardour with which any one is disposed to vindicate his own rights. Applied to God, it simply presents him to our view as the one supreme Jehovah, who as such claims—cannot indeed but claim—he were not the One, Eternal God, but an idol, if he did not claim—the undivided love and homage of his creatures, and who, consequently, must resist with holy zeal and indignation every attempt to deprive him of what is so peculiarly his own. It is only to give vividness to this idea, by investing it with the properties of an earthly relation, that the divine affection is so often presented under the special form of jealousy. It arises, as Calvin has remarked, from God's condescending to assume toward his people the character of a husband, in which respect he cannot bear a partner. "As he performs to us all the offices of a true and faithful husband, so he stipulates for love and conjugal chastity from us. Hence, when he rebukes the Jews for their apostacy, he complains that they have cast off chastity, and polluted themselves with adultery. Therefore, as the purer and chaster the husband is, the more grievously he is offended when he sees his wife inclining to a rival; so the Lord, who has betrothed us to himself in truth, declares that he burns with the hottest jealousy—whenever, neglecting the purity of his holy marriage, we defile ourselves with abominable lusts; and especially when the worship of his Deity, which ought to have been most carefully kept unimpaired, is transferred to another, or adulterated with some superstition; since, in this way, we not only violate our plighted troth, but defile the nuptial couch, by giving access to adulterers."*

But allowing that the notion of jealousy, when thus explained, is a righteous and necessary attribute of Jehovah, does not the objection hold, at least in regard to the particular form of its manifestation mentioned in the second commandment? If it becomes God to be jealous, yet is it not to make his jealousy interfere with his justice, when he declares his purpose to visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation? So one might judge, if looking, not merely to the attacks of infidels, but to the feeble and unsatisfactory attempts which have too often been made to explain the declaration by Christian divines. Grotius, for example, revolves it simply into the absolute sovereignty of God who has a right to do what he will with his own.† Warburton represents it as a temporary expedient to supply the lack of a future state of reward and punishment under the law; and in his usual way, contends that no otherwise could the principle be vindicated, and the several scriptures referring to it harmonized.‡ Michaelis,§ Paley,‖ and a host besides, while they also regard it as to a great extent a temporary arrangement, rest their defence of it mainly on the ground of its having to do only with temporal evils, and in no respect reaching to men's spiritual

* Inst. B. ii. c. 8, § 18.
† De Jure Belli et Pacis, ii. p. 593.
‡ Divine Legation, B. v. sec. 5.
§ Laws of Moses.
‖ Sermons.

and eternal interests. It is fatal to all these attempts at explanation, that none of them fairly grapples with the visitation of evil threatened, as a punishment. For, viewed in this light, which is unquestionably the scriptural one, such attempts are manifestly nothing more than mere shifts and evasions of the point at issue. When resolved into the sovereignty of God, it still remains to be asked, whether such an exercise of his sovereignty is consistent with those ideas of immutable justice, which are implanted in the human breast. When viewed as a temporary expedient to supply a want, which, to say the least, might, if real, have admitted of a very simple remedy, the question still waits for solution, whether the expedient itself was in proper accordance with the righteous principles which should regulate every government, whether human or divine. And when it is affirmed, that the penalties denounced in the threatening were only temporal, the reply surely is competent, why might not God do in eternity what he does in time? Or, if the principle on which the punishment proceeds, be not in all respects justifiable, how could it be acted on by God temporarily, any more than eternally? Is it consistent with the notion of a God of infinite rectitude, that he should do on a small, what he could not do on a large scale?

The fundamental error in the false explanations referred to, lies in the supposition of the children, who are to suffer, being in a different state morally from that of their parents—innocent children bearing the chastisement due to the transgressions of their wicked parents. But the words of the threatening purposely guard against such an idea, by describing the third and fourth generation, on whom the visitation of evil was to fall, as of *those that hate God;* just as, on the other hand, the mercy which was pledged to thousands, was promised as the dowry of those that *love* him. Such children alone are here concerned, who, in the language of Calvin, "imitate the piety of their progenitors." Indeed, Augustine has substantially expressed the right principle of interpretation on the subject, though he has sometimes failed in making the proper application of it, as when he says: "But the carnal generation also of the people of God belonging to the Old Testament, binds the sons to the sins of their parents; but the spiritual generation, as it has changed the inheritance, so also the threatenings of punishment, and the promises of reward."* And still more distinctly in his commentary on Ps. cix. 14, where he explains the visiting of the "iniquities of the fathers upon them that hate me," by saying, "that is, as their parents hated me; so that, just as the imitation of the good secures that even one's own sins are blotted out, so the imitation of the bad renders one obnoxious to the deserved punishment, not only of one's own sins, but also of the sins of those whose ways have been followed." In short, the Lord contemplates the existence among his professing worshippers of two entirely different *kinds* of generations—the one haters of God,

* Contra Julianum Pelagianum, Lib. vi. § 82.

and manifesting their hatred by depraving his worship and pursuing courses of transgression—the other lovers of God, and manifesting their love by steadfastly adhering in all dutiful obedience to the way of his holy commandments. To these last, though they should extend to thousands of generations, he would show his mercy, causing it to flow on from age to age in a perennial stream of blessing. But as he is the righteous God, to whom vengeance as well as mercy belongs, the free outpouring of his beneficence upon these, could not prevent or prejudice the execution of his justice upon that other class, who were entirely of a different spirit, and merited quite opposite treatment. It is an unwelcome subject, indeed; the merciful and gracious God has no delight in anticipating the day of evil, even for his most erring and wayward children; he shrinks, as it were, from contemplating the possibility of thousands being in this condition, and will not suffer himself to make mention of more than a third or a fourth generation rendering themselves the objects of his just displeasure. But still the wholesome truth must be declared, and the seasonable warning uttered. If men were determined to rebel against his authority, he could not leave himself without a witness, no not even in regard to the first race of transgressors, that he hated their iniquities, and must take vengeance of their inventions. But if, notwithstanding, the children embraced the sinfulness of their parents, with the manifest seal of Heaven's displeasure on it, as their iniquity would be more aggravated, so its punishment should become more severe; the descending and entailed curse would deepen as it flowed on, increasing with every increase of depravity and corruption, till the measure of iniquity being filled up, the wrath should fall on them to the uttermost.

That this is the aspect of the divine character and government, which the declaration in the second commandment was meant to exhibit, is evident alone from the glowing delineations of mercy and goodness, with which the visitation of evil upon the children of disobedient parents is here and in other places coupled.* But it is confirmed beyond all doubt by two distinct lines of reflection: 1. The facts of Israelitish history. These fully confirm the principle of God's government as now expounded, but give no countenance to the idea of a punishment being inflicted on the innocent for the guilty. However sinful one individual, or one generation might be, yet if the next in descent heartily turned to the Lord, they were sure of being received to pardon and blessing. We are furnished with a striking instance of this in the 14th chapter of Numbers, where we find Moses pleading for the pardon of Israel's transgressions, on the very ground of that revelation of the divine name or character in Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7, which precisely, as in the second commandment, combines the most touching representation of the divine mercy, with the threat to visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children. It never occurred to Moses, that

* Compare besides Ex. xxxiv. 5, 6; Numb. xiv. 18; Ps. ciii. 8, 9.

this threat stood at all in the way of their obtaining a complete forgiveness. He found, indeed, that the Lord had determined to visit upon that generation their iniquities, so far as to exclude them from the land of Canaan, but without in the least marring the better prospects of their children, who had learned to hate the deeds of their fathers. And when, indeed, was it otherwise? Is it not one of the most striking features in the whole history of ancient Israel, that, so far from suffering for the sins of former generations, they did not suffer even for their own when they truly repented, but were immediately visited with favour and blessing? And, on the other hand, how constantly do we find the divine judgments increasing in severity when successive generations hardened themselves in their evil courses? Nor did it rarely happen that the series of retributions reached their last issues by the third or fourth generation. It was so in particular with those who were put upon a course of special dealing—such as the house of Jeroboam, of Jehu, or Eli, &c. 2. Another source of confirmation to the principle as expounded by us, we find in the explanations given concerning it in the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. These prophets lived at the time when the descending curse had utterly failed, so far as it had gone, to turn the children from the sinful courses of their fathers, and was fast running to a fatal termination. But the infatuated people being not less distinguished for self-righteous pride, than for their obstinate perseverance in wickedness, they were constantly complaining, as stroke after stroke fell upon them, that they were made unjustly to bear the sins of their fathers. Anticipating our modern infidels, they charged God with injustice and inequality in his ways of dealing, instead of turning their eye inward, as they should have done, upon their own unrighteousness, and forsaking it for the way of peace. The 18th chapter of Ezekiel contains a lengthened expostulation with these stout-hearted offenders, in the course of which he utterly disclaims the interpretation they put upon the word and providence of God; and assures them, that if they would only turn from their evil doings, they would not have to suffer either for their own or their father's guilt. And Jeremiah, in his 31st chapter, speaking of the new covenant, and of the blessed renovation it would accomplish on those who should be partakers of its grace, foretells, that there would be an end of such foolish and wicked charges upon God for the inequality of his ways of dealing—for such an increased measure of the Spirit would be given, such an inward conformity to his laws would be produced, that his dealing with transgressors would in a manner cease—his ways would be all acquiesced in as holy, just, and good.*

* The view here given of the scope and purport of these two passages is so clearly in accordance with their obvious import, that we deem it quite unnecessary to enter into any express refutation of Warburton's unnatural and violent interpretation.

CHAPTER III.

THE LAW CONTINUED—FURTHER EXCEPTIONS—THE APPOINTMENT OF THE SABBATH.

We pass now from the objections found in the special declarations connected with the decalogue, to such as are drawn from the nature of the things actually required. It is only in reference to the fourth commandment, the law of the Sabbath, that any objection in this respect is made. But the character of universal and permanent obligation, it is argued, which we would ascribe to the decalogue, cannot properly belong to it, since one of its precepts enjoins the observance of a merely ceremonial institution—an institution strictly and rigorously binding on the Jews, but, like other ceremonial and shadowy institutions, done away in Christ. It would be impossible to enumerate the authors, ancient and modern, who in one form or another have adopted this view. There can be no question that they embrace a very large proportion of the more learned and eminent divines of the Christian church, from the fathers to the present time. Much diversity of opinion, however, prevails among those who agree in the same general view, as to the extent to which the law of the Sabbath was ceremonial, and in what sense the obligation to observe it lies upon the followers of Jesus. In the judgment of some, the distinction of days is entirely abolished as a divine arrangement, and no farther obligatory upon the conscience, than as it may be sanctioned by competent ecclesiastical authority for the purposes of social order and religious improvement. By others, the obligation is held to involve the duty of setting apart an adequate portion of time for the due celebration of divine worship—the greater part leaving that portion of time quite indefinite, while some would insist upon its being at least equal to what was appointed under the law, if possible, even more. Finally, there are still others, who consider the ceremonial and shadowy part of the institution to have more peculiarly stood in the observance of precisely the seventh day of the week as a day of sacred rest, and who conceive the obligation still in force, as requiring another whole day to be consecrated to religious exercises.

It would require a separate treatise, rather than a single chapter, to take up separately such manifold subdivisions of opinion, and investigate the grounds of each. We must for the present view the subject in its general bearings, and endeavour to have some leading principles ascertained and fixed. In doing this, we might press at the outset the consideration of this law being one of those engraved upon tables of stone, as a proof that it, equally with the rest, possessed a peculiarly important and durable character. For the argument is by no means disposed of, as we formerly remarked, by the supposition of Baehr and others, that the ceremonial, as well as the other precepts of the law, were re-

presented in the ten commandments; and still less by the assertion of Paley, that little regard was practically paid in the books of Moses to the distinction between matters of a ceremonial and moral, of a temporary and perpetual kind. It is easy to multiply assertions and suppositions of such a nature; but the fact is still to be accounted for, why the law of the Sabbath should have been deemed of such paramount importance, as to have found a place among those which were "written as with a pen in the rock for ever?" Or why, if in reality nothing more than a ceremonial and shadowy institute, this, in particular, should have been chosen to represent all of a like kind? Why not rather, as the whole of the genius of the economy might have led us in such a case to expect, should the precept have been one respecting the observance of the great annual feasts, or a faithful compliance with the sacrificial services?* It is impossible to answer these questions satisfactorily, or to show any valid reason for the introduction of the Sabbath into the law of the two tables, on the supposition of its possessing only a ceremonial character. But we shall not press more at large the argument in question, or endeavour to explain the futility of the reasons by which it is met, as in itself it is rather a strong presumption, than a conclusive evidence of the permanent obligation of the fourth command.

It deserves more notice, however, than it usually receives in this point of view, and should alone be almost held conclusive, that the ground on which the obligation to keep the Sabbath is based in the command, is the most universal in its bearing that could possibly be conceived. "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy, for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day."

There is manifestly nothing Jewish here; nothing connected with individual interests or even national history; the grand fact, out of which the precept is made to grow, is of equal significance to the whole world; and why should not the precept be the same, of which it forms the basis? God's method of procedure in creating the visible heavens and earth, produced as the formal reason for instituting a distinctive, temporary Jewish ordinance! Could it be possible to conceive a more "lame and impotent conclusion?" And this, too, in the most compact piece of legislation in existence! It seems, indeed, as if God in the appointment of this law had taken special precautions against the attempts which he foresaw would be made to get free of the institution, and that on this account he laid its foundations deep in the original framework and constitution of nature. The law as a whole, and certain also of its precepts, he was pleased to enforce by considerations drawn from his dealings toward Israel, and the peculiar relations which he now held to them. But when he comes to impose the obligation of the Sabbath,

* The Roman Catholics have felt the force of this in reference to their own church, which, like the Jewish, deals so much in ceremonies, and therefore have sometimes, in their catechism, presented the fourth commandment thus: Remember the festivals to keep them holy.

he rises far beyond any consideration of a special kind, or any passing event of history. He ascends to primeval time, and, standing as on the platform of the newly created world, dates from thence the commencement and the ordination of a perpetually recurring day of rest. Since the Lord has thus honoured the fourth commandment above the others, by laying for it a foundation so singularly broad and deep, is it yet to be held in its obligation and import the narrowest of them all? Shall this, strange to think, be the only one which did not utter a voice for all times and all generations? How much more reasonable is the conclusion of Calvin, who in this expressed substantially the opinion of all the more eminent reformers: "Unquestionably God assumed to himself the seventh day, and consecrated it when he finished the creation of the world, that he might keep his worshippers entirely free from all other cares, while they were employed in meditating on the beauty, excellence, and splendour of his works. It is not proper, indeed, to allow any period to elapse, without our attentively considering the wisdom, power, justice, and goodness of God, as displayed in the admirable workmanship and government of the world. But because our minds are unsuitable, and are thence liable to wander and be distracted, God in his own mercy, consulting our infirmities, sets apart one day from the rest, and commands it to be kept free from all earthly cares and employments, lest any thing should interrupt that holy exercise....In this respect the necessity of a Sabbath is common to us with the people of old, that we may be free on one day (of the week,) and so, may be better prepared both for learning and for giving testimony to our faith."*

But then, it is argued, that whatever may have been the reason for admitting the law of the Sabbath into the ten commandments, and engraving it on the tables of stone, it still is in its own nature different from all the rest. They are moral, and because moral, of universal force and obligation, while this is ceremonial, owing its existence to positive enactment, and therefore binding only so far as the enactment itself might be extended. The duties en-

* Comm. on Ex. xx. 11. The same view is taken in his notes on Gen. ii. 3: "God, therefore, first rested, then he blessed that rest, that it might be sacred among men through all coming ages; he consecrated each seventh day to rest, that his own example might continually serve as a rule," &c. To the same effect, Luther on that passage, who holds, that "if Adam had continued in innocence, he would yet have kept the seventh day sacred," and concludes, "Therefore the Sabbath was, from the beginning of the world, appointed to the worship of God." In my tract on the real opinions of the Reformers on the Sabbath, I have given the views of all the other leading divines of the Reformation. They are of one mind on this branch of the subject. The idea, that the Sabbath was first given to the Israelites in the wilderness, and that the words in Gen. ii. only proleptically refer to that future circumstance, is an after thought—originating in the fond conceit of some Jewish Rabbins, who sought thereby to magnify their nation, and adopted only by such Christian divines as had already made up their minds on the temporary obligation of the Sabbath. The passage, Heb. iv. 3, &c., is also a clear authority in the New Testament scriptures for the primeval institution of the Sabbath. The inspired writer is there speaking of the successive rests of God, into which men have been invited by faith and obedience to enter; and his mentioning the seventh-day rest, in this connexion, as having taken place at the finishing of the works of creation, must imply the appointment of the day for man from that period.

joined in the former are founded in the nature of things, and the essential relations in which men stand to God, or to their fellow-men; hence they do not depend on any positive enactment, but are co-extensive in their obligation with reason and conscience. But the law of the Sabbath prescribing one day in seven to be a day of sacred rest, has its foundation simply in the absolute appointment of God, and hence, unlike the rest, is not fixed and universal, but special and mutable.

There is unquestionably an element of truth in this, but the application made of it, in the present instance, is unwarranted and fallacious. It is true that the Sabbath is a positive institution, though intimately connected with God's work in creation; and apart from his command, it could not have been ascertained by the light of reason, that one entire day should at regular intervals be consecrated for bodily and spiritual rest, and especially that one in seven was the proper period to be fixed upon. In this respect we can easily recognise a distinction between the law of the Sabbath, and the laws which prohibit such crimes as lying, theft, or murder. But it does not therefore follow, that the Sabbath is in such a sense a positive, as to be a merely partial, temporary, ceremonial institution, and like others of this description done away in Christ. For a law may be positive in its origin, and yet neither local nor transitory in its destination; it may be positive in its origin, and yet equally needed and designed for all nations and ages of the world.

For of what nature, I ask, is the institution of marriage? The seventh commandment bears respect to that institution, and is thrown as a sacred fence around its sanctity. But is not marriage in its origin a positive institution? Has it any other foundation than the original act of God in making one man and one woman, and positively ordaining, that the man should cleave to the woman, and the two be one flesh?* Wherever this is not recognised, as it is not in part at least, in Mahommedan and heathen lands, and by certain infidels of the baser sort in Christendom, there also the moral and binding obligation of the ordinance is also disowned. But can any humble believer disown it? Would he not indignantly reject the thought of its being only a temporary ordinance, because standing, as to its first foundation, in God's method of creation and his ordination thereupon ensuing? Or does he feel himself warranted to assume, that because, after Christ's appearing, the marriage-union was treated as an emblem of Christ's union to the Church, the literal ordinance is thereby changed or impaired? Assuredly not. And why should any deal otherwise with the Sabbath? This too, in its origin, is a positive institution, and was also, it may be, from the first designed to serve as an emblem of

* Gen. ii. 23, 24. This has a great deal more the look of a proleptical statement, than what is written at the beginning of the chapter about the Sabbath, for it speaks of leaving father and mother, while still Adam and Eve alone existed. Yet our Lord regards it as a statement fairly and naturally drawn from the facts of creation, and as applicable to the earlier as to the later periods of the world's history (Matth. xix. 4, 5.)

spiritual things—an emblem of the blessed rest which man was called to enjoy in God. But in both respects it stands most nearly on a footing with the ordinance of marriage; both alike owed their institution to the formal act and appointment of God; both also took their commencement at the birth of time—in a world unfallen, when, as there was no need for the antitypes of redemption, so no ceremonial types or shadows of these could properly have a place; and both are destined to last till the songs of the redeemed shall have ushered in the glories of a world restored.

The distinction, we apprehend, is often too broadly drawn in discussions on this subject, between the positive and the moral; as if the two belonged entirely to different regions, and but incidentally touched upon each other. As if also the strictly moral part of the world's machinery were in itself so complete and independent, that its movements might proceed of themselves in a course of lofty isolation from all positive enactments and institutions. This was not the case even in paradise, and much less could it be so afterwards. A certain amount of what is positive in appointment is absolutely necessary to settle the relations in connexion with which the moral sentiments are to work and develop themselves. The banks which confine and regulate the current of a river, are not less essential to its existence than the waters that flow within them; for the one mark out and fix the channel which keeps the other in their course. And, in like manner, the moral feelings and affections of our nature must have something outward and positive, determining the kind of landmarks which they are to observe, and the channels through which they are to flow. There may, no doubt, be many things of this nature at different times appointed by God, that are variable and temporary, to suit the present condition of his church and the immediate ends he has in view. But there may also be some coeval with the existence of the world, founded in the very nature and constitution of things, so that the love, which is the fulfilment of all obligation, cannot operate steadfastly or beneficially without them.

The real question, then, in regard to the Sabbath, is, whether such love can exist in the heart, without disposing it to observe the rest there enjoined. Is not the present constitution of nature such, as to render this necessary for securing the purposes which God contemplated in creation? Could mankind, as one great family, properly thrive and prosper even in their lower interests, as we may suppose their beneficent Creator intended, without such a day of rest perpetually coming round to refresh their wearied natures? Could they otherwise command sufficient time, amid the busy cares and occupations of life, to mind the higher interests of themselves and their households? Without such a salutary monitor ever and anon returning, and bringing with it time and opportunity for all to attend to its admonitions, would not the spiritual and eternal be lost sight of amid the seen and temporal? Or, to mount higher still, how, without this ordinance, could any proper and adequate testimony be kept up throughout the world in honour

of the God that made it? Must not reason herself own it to be a suitable and becoming homage rendered to His sole and supreme lordship of creation, for men on every returning seventh day to cease from their own works, and take a breathing-time to realize their dependence upon him, and give a more special application to the things which concern his glory? In short, abolish this wise and blessed institution, and must not love both to God and man be deprived of one of its best safeguards and most important channels of working—God himself become practically dishonoured and forgotten, and man be worn down with deadening and oppressive toil?

Experience has but one answer to give to these questions. Hence, where the true religion has been unknown, it has always been found necessary to appoint, by some constituted authority, a certain number of holydays, which have often, even in heathen countries, exceeded, rarely any where have fallen short of, the number of God's instituted Sabbaths. The animal and mental, the bodily and spiritual nature of man alike demand them. Even Plato deemed the appointment of such days of so benign and gracious a tendency, that he ascribed them to that pity which "the gods have for mankind, born to painful labour, that they might have an ease and cessation from their toils."* And what is this but an experimental testimony to the truth of God's having ordered his work of creation with a view to the appointment of such an institution in providence? and to his wisdom and goodness in having done so? It is manifest, besides, that while men may of themselves provide substitutes to a certain extent for the Sabbath, yet these never can secure more than a portion of the ends for which it has been appointed, nor could any thing short of the clear sanction and authority of the living God, command for it general respect and attention. The inferior benefits which it carries in its train are not sufficient, as experience has also too amply testified, to maintain its observance, if it loses its hold upon men's minds in a religious point of view. So that there can scarcely be a plainer departure from the duty of love we owe alike to God and man, than to attempt to weaken the foundations of such an ordinance, or to encourage its violation.

If the broad and general view of the subject which has now been given, were fairly considered, the other and minuter objections, which are commonly urged in support of the strictly Jewish character of the Sabbatical institution, would be easily disposed of. Even taken apart, there is none of them which, if due account is made of special circumstances, may not be satisfactorily removed.

1. No notice is taken of the institution during the antediluvian and early patriarchal periods of sacred history; the profanation of it is not mentioned among the crimes for which the flood was sent, or fire and brimstone rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah; it never rises distinctly into view as a divine institution till the time of Moses; whence, it is inferred, it only had its commencement then.

* De Leg. II. p. 787, as quoted by Barrow, vol. V. p. 561.

But how many duties of undoubtedly perpetual and universal obligation might be cut off on similar grounds? And how few comparatively of the sins which we may infer with the utmost certainty to have been practised are noticed in those brief records of the world's history? It is rather, as we might have expected, the general principles that were acted upon—or, in regard to heinous transgressors, the more flagrant misdeeds into which their extreme depravity ran out, that find a place in the earliest portions of sacred history. Besides, even in the later and fuller accounts, it is usual, through very long periods of time, to omit any reference to institutions which were known to have had a settled existence. There is no notice, for example, of circumcision from the time of Joshua to the Babylonish exile; but how fallacious would be the conclusion, from such silence, that the rite itself was not observed? Even the Sabbath, notwithstanding the prominent place it holds in the decalogue and the institutions of Moses, is never mentioned again till the days of Elisha (nearly seven hundred years later,) when we meet with an incidental and passing allusion to it (2 Kings iv. 23.) Need we wonder, then, that in such peculiarly brief compends of history as are given from the creation to Moses, there should be a similar silence?

And yet it can by no means be affirmed, that they are without manifest indications of the existence of a seventh day of sacred rest. The record of its appointment at the close of the creation-period, as we have already noticed, is of the most explicit kind, and is afterwards confirmed by the not less explicit reference in the fourth commandment, of its origin and commencement to the same period. Nor can any reason be assigned one-half so natural and probable as this, for the division of time into weeks of seven days, which meets us in the history of Noah and the later patriarchal times, and of which also very early traces occur in profane history.* Then, finally, the manner in which it first presents itself on the field of Israelitish history; as an existing ordinance, which God himself respected, in the giving of the manna, before the law had been promulgated (Ex. xvi.,) is a clear proof of its prior institution. True,

* Gen. viii. 10, 12; xxix. 27. A large portion of the Jewish writers hold, that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, and was observed by the patriarchs, although some thought differently. References to various of their more eminent writers are given in Meyer, De Temporibus Sacris et Festis Diebus Hebræorum, P. ii. c. 9 Selden (De Jure Nat. et Gent. L. iii. 12,) has endeavoured to prove that the older Jewish writers all held the first institution of the Sabbath to have been in the wilderness, though by special revelation made known previously to Abraham, and that the notice taken of the subject at the creation is by prolepsis. This, however, does not appear to have been the general opinion among them, certainly not that of some of their leading writers; and as Meyer remarks, it by no means follows from their having sometimes held the proleptical reference in Genesis to the institution of the Sabbath in the wilderness, that they therefore denied its prior institution in Paradise. See also Owen's Preliminary Dissertations to his Com. on Heb. Ex. 36; where, further, the notices are gathered which are to be found in ancient heathen sources regarding the primitive division of time into sevens, and the sacredness of the seventh day. As to the ancient nations of the world not observing it, or not being specially charged with neglecting it, the same may be said in reference to the third commandment, the fifth, many of the sins of the seventh, eighth, and ninth. Besides, when they forsook God himself, of how little importance was it how they spent his Sabbaths!

indeed, the Israelites themselves seem then to have been in a great measure ignorant of such an institution—not altogether ignorant, as is too commonly taken for granted, but ignorant of its proper observance, so far as to wonder that God should have bestowed a double provision on the sixth day, to relieve them from any labour in gathering and preparing it on the seventh. Habituated as they had become to the manners, and bowed down by the oppression of Egypt, it had been strange, indeed, if any other result should have occurred. Hence, it is mentioned by Moses, and by Nehemiah, as a distinguished token of the Lord's goodness to them, that in consequence of bringing them out of Egypt, he made them to know or gave them his Sabbaths. (Ex. xvi. 29; Deut. v. 15; Neh. ix. 14.)

2. But the institution of the Sabbath was declared to be a sign between God and the Israelites, that they might know that he was the Lord who sanctified them. (Ex. xxxi. 13.) And if a sign or token of God's covenant with Israel, then it must have been a new and positive institution, and one which they alone were bound to observe, since it must separate between them and others. So Warburton,* and a host of others. We say nothing against its having been as to its formal institution of a positive nature, for there, we think, many defenders of the Sabbath have lost themselves.† But its being constituted a sign between God and Israel, neither inferred its entire novelty, nor its special and exclusive obligation upon them. Warburton himself has contended that the bow in the cloud was not rendered less fit for being a sign of the covenant with Noah, that it had existed in the antediluvian period. And still less might the Sabbath's being a primeval institution have rendered it unfit to stand as a sign of the Israelitish covenant, as this had respect not so much to its appointment on the part of God, as to its observance on the part of the people. He wished them simply to regard it as one of the chosen means by which he intended them to become, not only a comfortable and blessed, but also a holy nation. Nor could its being destined for such a use among them, in the least interfere with its obligation or its observance among others. Circumcision was thus also made the sign of the Abrahamic covenant, although it had been observed from time immemorial by various surrounding tribes and nations, from whom still the members of the covenant were to remain separate. And with perfect propriety in both cases. For, it was not the merely external rite or custom which God regarded, but its spiritual meaning and design. When connected with his covenant, or embodied in his law, it was stamped as a religious institution, it acquired a strictly religious use, and only in so far as it was observed with a reference to this, could it fitly serve as a sign of God's covenant.

* Divine Leg. B. iv., Note R. R. R. R.

† It has been called a moral-positive command—partly moral and partly positive; in itself a positive enactment, but with moral grounds to recommend or enforce it. See, for example, Ridgely's Body of Divinity, ii. p. 267, who expresses the view of almost all evangelical divines of the period in this country. The distinction, however, is not happy, as the same substantially may be said of all the ceremonial institutions. Moral reasons were connected with them all, and yet they are abolished.

Indeed, a conclusion precisely the reverse of the one just referred to, should rather be drawn from the circumstance of the Sabbath having been taken for a sign that God sanctified Israel. There can be no question that holiness in heart and conduct was the grand sign of their being his people. In so far as they fulfilled the exhortation, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," they possessed the mark of his children. And the proper observance of the Sabbatical rest, being so distinctly put as a sign of the same, was a proof of its singular importance to the life of religion and morality. This, it virtually implied, would thrive and flourish if the Sabbath was duly observed, but languish and die if it fell into desuetude. Hence, at the close of a long expostulation with the people regarding their sins, and such especially as indicated only a hypocritical love to God, and a palpable hatred or indifference to their fellow-men, the prophet Isaiah presses the due observance of the Sabbath as in itself a sufficient remedy for the evil: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it,"—(Isa. lviii. 13, 14.)

This passage may fitly be regarded as an explanation of the sense in which the Lord meant them to regard the Sabbath as a sign between them and him. And it is clear, on a moment's reflection, that the prophet could never have attached the importance he did to the Sabbath, nor so peculiarly connected it with the blessing of the covenant, if the mere outward rest had been all that the institution contemplated. This is what the objectors we now argue with seem uniformly to take for granted; as if the people were really sanctified when they simply rested every Sabbath day from their labours. The command had a far deeper import, and much more was involved in such a compliance with it, as was to prove a sign between them and God. It was designed at once to carry the heart up in holy affections to its Creator, and outwards in acts of good-will and kindness to man on earth. Hence, its proper observance is so often put, both in the law and the prophets, for the sum of religion. This is frankly admitted by some who urge the objection (for example Barrow,) while they still hold it to have been a ceremonial institution. But we would ask if any other ceremonial institution can be pointed to as having been thus honoured? Are they not often rather comparatively dishonoured, by being placed in a relation of inferiority to the weightier matters of the law? And we might also ask if precisely the same practical value is not attached to the strict religious observance of the Lord's day now, by all writers of piety, and even by those who, with strange perversion or inconsistency, labour to establish the freedom of Christians from the obligation of the Sabbath? It is one of the burdens, says Bar-

row, which the law of liberty has taken off us, and yet he has no sooner said it, than he tells us in regard to the very highest and most spiritual duties of this law, that we are much more obliged to discharge them than the Jews could be.* Paley, too, has no sooner tried to get rid of the binding obligation of the Sabbath, than he proceeds to show the necessity of dedicating the Sunday to religious exercises, to the exclusion of all ordinary works and recreations; and still more expressly, in his first sermon, written at a more advanced stage of life, when he knew more personally of the power of religion, he speaks of "keeping holy the Lord's day regularly and most particularly," as an essential mark of a Christian.† The leading reformers were unanimous on this point, as I have shown elsewhere, "holding it to be the duty of all sound Christians to use the Lord's day as one of holy rest to him, and that, by withdrawing themselves, not only from sin and vanity, but also from those worldly employments and recreations which belong only to a present life, and by yielding themselves wholly to the public exercises of God's worship, and to the private duties of devotion, excepting only in cases of necessity or mercy." The learned Rivet, also, who unhappily argued (in his work on the Decalogue) against the obligation of keeping the Sabbath as imposed in the fourth commandment, yet deplored the prevailing disregard of the Lord's day, as one of the crying evils of the times; and Vitringa raised the same lamentation in his day (on Isa. lviii. 13.)

What, then, should induce such men to contend against the strict and literal obligation of the fourth command? They must be influenced by one of two reasons: either they dislike the spirit of holiness that breathes in it, or, loving this, they somehow mistake the real nature of the obligation there imposed. There can be no doubt, that the former is the cause which prompts such as are mere formalists in religion to decry this obligation; and as little doubt, we think, in regard to the Reformers and pious divines of later times, that the latter cause was what influenced them. This we shall find occasion to explain under the next form of objection, to which we now proceed.

3. It is objected, that the Sabbath as imposed on the Jews, had a rigour and severity in it, quite incompatible with the genius of the gospel: the person who violated its sacredness, by doing ordinary work on that day, was to be punished with death; and so far was the cessation from work carried, that even the kindling of a fire or going out of one's place was interdicted (Ex. xvi. 29; xxxv. 3.) It looks as if men were determined to get rid of the Sabbath by any means, when the capital punishment inflicted on the violators of it, in the Jewish state, is held up as a proof of its transitory and merely national character. For there is nothing of this in the fourth commandment itself; and it was afterwards added to this, in common with many other statutes, as a check on the pre-

* Works, V. p. 565, 568.

† Moral and Polit. Philosophy, B. V. c. 7 and 8, comp. with 1st of the Sermons on several subjects.

sumptuous violation of what God wished them to regard as the fundamental laws of the kingdom. A similar violation of the first, the second, the third, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh commandments, had the same punishment annexed to it; but who would thence argue, that the obligation to practise the duties they required, was binding only during the Old Testament dispensation?

The other part of the objection demands a longer answer; in which we must first distinctly mark what is the precise point to be determined. The real question is, Did the fourth commandment oblige the Jews to any thing which the people of God are under no obligation now to perform? Did it simply enjoin a rigid cessation from all ordinary labour, every seventh day, and did such cessation constitute the kind of sanctification it required? Such unquestionably was the opinion entertained by Calvin and most of the Reformers; who consequently held the Sabbath exacted of the Israelites under this precept, to be chiefly of a ceremonial nature, foreshadowing, through its outward repose, the state of peaceful and blessed rest, which believers were to enjoy in Christ, and like other shadows vanishing when he appeared. There is certainly a colour of truth in this idea, as we shall have occasion to notice under the next objection, but not in the sense understood by them. Their opinion of what the Jewish Sabbath *should* have been, almost entirely coincided with what it actually *was*, after a cold and dead formalism had taken the place of a living piety. But, so far from being justified by the law itself, it is the very notion which our Lord sought repeatedly to expose, by showing the practical impossibility of carrying it out under the former dispensation itself. Parents performed on the Sabbath the operation of circumcising their children; priests did the work connected with the temple-service; persons of all sorts went through the labours necessary to preserve or sustain life in themselves or their cattle; and yet they were blameless—the command stood unimpaired, notwithstanding the performance of such works on the seventh day, for they were not inconsistent with its real design. In regard to all such cases, Christ announced the maxim: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,"—the Sabbath, of course, in its original purport and existing obligation—not under any change or modification now to be introduced, for if there had been any intention of that sort, it would manifestly have been out of place then to speak of it—but the Sabbath as imposed in the fourth commandment upon the Israelites:—this Sabbath was made for man, as a means to promote his real interests and well-being, and not as as a remorseless idol, to which these were to be sacrificed: "To work in the way of doing good to a fellow-creature, or entering into the employments of God's worship, is not now, never was, any interference with the proper duties of the Sabbath, but rather a fulfilment of them. 'Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath,'—He, who is Lord of man must needs also be Lord of that which was made for man's good—but its Lord, not to turn it to any other purpose than that for which it was originally given, merely to use it my-

self, and teach you how to use it for the same. You do, therefore, grievously err in supposing it possible for me to do any thing inconsistent with the design of this institution; for though, as the Father worketh hitherto, I also must work on this day (John v. 17,) so far as the ends of the divine government may require, yet nothing is or can be done by me, which is not in the strictest sense a divine work, and as such suitable to the day of God."*

It is to wrest our Lord's words quite beside the purpose for which they were spoken, to regard him in those declarations he made respecting the Sabbath, as intending to relax the existing law, and bring in some new modification of it. His discourse was clearly aimed at convincing the Jews that this law did not, as they erroneously conceived, absolutely prohibit all work, but work only in so far as the higher ends of God's glory and man's best interests might render needful. Precisely as in the second commandment, the prohibition regarding the making of any graven image or similitude, was not intended simply to denounce all pictures and statues—both, in fact, had a place in the temple itself—but to interdict their employment in the worship of God, so that his worshippers might be free to serve him in spirit and in truth. And as men might have abstained from using these, while still far from yielding the spiritual worship which the second command really required, so they might equally have ceased from ordinary labour on the seventh day, and yet been far from sanctifying it according to the fourth command.

This was distinctly enough perceived by some of the more thinking portion of the Jews themselves. Hence, not only does Philo speak of "the custom of philosophizing," as he calls it, on the seventh day, but we find Abenezra expressly stating, that "the Sabbath was given to man, that he might consider the works of God, and meditate in his law." To the same effect Abarbanel: "The seventh day has been sequestered for learning the divine law, and for remembering well the explanations and inquiries regarding it." As is taught in Gemara Hierosol: "Sabbaths and holidays were only appointed for meditating in the law of God; and therefore it is said, in Medrash Schamoth Rabba, that the Sabbath is to be prized as the whole law." Another of their leading authorities, R. Menasse Ben Isr. even characterizes it as a notable error, to imagine the Sabbath to have been instituted for idleness; for as idleness is

* No texts have been more perverted from their obvious meaning, by the opponents of the Sabbath, than those referred to in Mark ii. 27, 28, about the Son of Man being Lord of the Sabbath, and the Sabbath being made for man, as if the Lord had been there bringing in something new, instead of explaining what was old. The latter is also held "as manifestly implying, that the observance of the Sabbath was not a duty of an essential and unchangeable nature, such as those for which man *is* especially constituted and ordained," (Bib. Cyclop. art. Sabbath.) But the same may be said of marriage—it was made for man, and not man for it—and seeing, if there be no marriage there can be no adultery, is therefore the seventh command only of temporary obligation? Or, since where there is no property, there can be no theft, and man was not made for property, is the eighth command also out of date? The main point is, Were not they all alike coeval with man's introduction into his present state, and needful to abide with him till its close?

the mother of all vice, it would then have been the occasion of more evil than good.*

These comments, wonderfully good to come from such a quarter, are in perfect accordance with the import of the fourth commandment; that is, if this commandment is to be dealt with by the same mode of interpretation which is made to rule the meaning of the rest—if it is to be regarded simply as prohibiting one kind of works, that those of an opposite kind may be performed. Yet, in strange oversight of this, perhaps also unwittingly influenced by the mistaken views and absurd practices of the Jews, such men even as Calvin and Vitringa held, that in the Jewish law of the Sabbath, there was only inculcated a cessation from bodily labour, and that the observance of this cessation formed the substance of Sabbatical duty.† Their holding this, however, did not, we must remember, lead them to deny the fact of God's having set apart, and men's being in all ages bound to observe, one day in every seven to be especially devoted to the worship and service of God. This, with one voice, they held; but they conceived the primeval and lasting institution of the Sabbath to have been so far accommodated to the symbolical character of the Jewish religion, as to demand almost nothing from the Jews, but a day of bodily rest. And this rest they farther conceived to have been required, not as valuable in itself, but as the legal shadow of better things to come in Christ: —So that they might at once affirm the Jewish Sabbath to be abolished, and yet hold the obligation binding upon Christians to keep, by another mode of observance, one day in seven sacred to the Lord. This is just what they did. And therefore Gualter, in his summary of the views of the divines of the Reformation upon this subject, has brought distinctly out these two features in their opinions—what they parted with and what they retained: "The Sabbath properly signifies rest and leisure from servile work, and at the same time is used to denote the seventh day, which God at the beginning of the world consecrated to holy rest, and afterwards in the law confirmed by a special precept. And although the primitive church abrogated the Sabbath, in so far as it was a legal shadow, lest it should savour of Judaism; yet it did not abolish that sacred rest and repose, but transferred the keeping of it to the following day, which was called the Lord's day, because on it Christ rose from the dead. The use of this day, therefore, is the same with what the Sabbath formerly was among the true worshippers of God." Only, the particular way, or kind of service, in which it is now to be turned to this sacred use, is different from what it was in Judaism, and he goes on to describe how the Reformers thought the day should be spent: viz. in a total withdrawing from worldly cares and pleasures, as far as practicable, and laying out the time in the public and private exercises of worship.‡

* See Meyer de Temp. Sacris et Festis Diebus Heb., p. 197–199, where the authorities are given at length.

† Calvin. Inst. II. c. 8. Vitringa Synagog. vet. II. c. 2, and com. on Isa. c. lvi.

‡ I have entered so fully into the views of the Reformers, because their sentiments on this subject are almost universally misunderstood, even by theologians, and their

It does not offer the least contrariety to the interpretation we have given of the fourth commandment, as affecting the Jews, that Moses on one occasion enjoined the people not to go out of their place or tents on the Sabbath-day. For that manifestly had respect to the gathering of the manna, and was simply a prohibition against their going out, as on other days, to obtain food. Neither is the order against kindling a fire on the Sabbath any argument for an opposite view; for it was not less evidently a temporary appointment, suitable to their condition in a wilderness of burning sand, necessary there perhaps to ensure even a decent conformity to the rest of the Sabbath, but palpably unsuitable to the general condition of the people, when settled in a land which is subject to great vicissitudes, and much diversity as to heat and cold. It was in fact plainly impracticable as a national regulation; and was not considered by the people at large binding on them in their settled state, as may be gathered from Josephus noticing it as a peculiarity of the Essenes, that they would not kindle a fire on the Sabbath. (Wars, B. II. c. 8, § 9.) Indeed, it is no part of the fourth commandment, fairly interpreted, to prohibit ordinary labour, excepting in so far as it tends to interfere with the proper sanctification of the time to God, and this in most cases would rather be promoted, than hindered, by the kindling of a fire for purposes of comfort

names have often been abused, and indeed still are so, to support views which they would themselves have most strongly reprobated. The ground of the whole error lay in their not rightly understanding—what, indeed, is only now coming to be properly understood—the symbolical character of the Jewish worship. They viewed it too exclusively in a typical aspect, in its reference to gospel things, and saw but very dimly and imperfectly its design and fitness to give a present expression to the faith and holiness of the worshipper. Hence, *positive* institutions were considered as altogether the same with *ceremonial*, and the services connected with them as all of necessity, bodily, typical, shadowy, therefore done away in Christ. In this way superficial readers, who glance only at occasional passages in their writings, and do not take these in connexion with the whole state of theological opinion then prevalent regarding the old and new dispensations, find no difficulty in exhibiting the Reformers as against all Sabbatical observances; while, if it suited their purpose to look a little farther, another set of passages might be found, which seem to conclude the very reverse. Archbishop Whately says, (Second Series of Essays, p. 206,) that the English Reformers were almost unanimous in disconnecting the obligation regarding the keeping of the Lord's day among Christians, from the fourth commandment, and resting it simply on the practice of the apostles and the early church—thus making the Christian Lord's day an essentially different institution from the Jewish Sabbath. We don't need to investigate the subject separately as it affects them, for their opinions, as the Archbishop indeed asserts, agreed with those of the Continental Reformers. But we affirm, that the Reformers, as a body, *did* hold the divine authority and binding obligation of the fourth command, as requiring one day in seven to be employed in the worship and service of God, admitting only of works of necessity and of mercy to the poor and afflicted. The release from legal bondage, of which they speak, included simply the obligation to keep precisely the seventh day of the week, and the external rest, which they conceived to be so rigorously binding on the Jews, that even the doing of charitable works was a breach of it—the very mistake of the Pharisees. In its results, however, the doctrinal error regarding the fourth commandment has been very disastrous even in England, but still more so on the Continent. However strict the Reformers were personally, as to the practical observance of the Lord's day—so strict, especially in Geneva, that they were charged by some with Judaizing—the separation they made here between the law and the gospel soon wrought most injuriously upon the life of religion; and the saying of Owen was lamentably verified: "Take this day off from the basis whereon God hath fixed it, and all human substitutions of any thing in the like kind, will quickly discover their own vanity."

and refreshment. So we judge, for example, in regard to the sixth commandment, which, being intended to guard and protect the sacredness of man's life, does not absolutely prevent all manner of killing, nay, may sometimes rather be said to require this, that life may be preserved. In like manner, it was not work in the abstract that was forbidden in the fourth commandment, but work only in so far as it interfered with the sanctified use of the day. And the endless restrictions and limitations of the Jews, in our Lord's time and since, about the Sabbath day's journey, and the particular acts that were, or were not lawful on that day, are only to be regarded as the wretched puerilities of men, in whose hands the spirit of the precept had already evaporated, and for whom nothing more remained than to dispute about the bounds and lineaments of its dead body.

4. But then, there is an express abolition of Sabbath-days in the gospel, as the mere shadows of gospel realities; and the apostle expressly discharges believers from judging one another regarding their observance, and even mourns over the Galatians, as bringing their Christian condition into doubt, by observing days and months and years. We shall not waste time by considering the unsatisfactory attempts, which have frequently been made to account for such statements, by many who hold the still abiding obligation of the fourth commandment. But supposing this commandment simply to require, as we have endeavoured to show it does, the withdrawal of men's minds from worldly cares and occupations, that they might be free to give themselves to the spiritual service of God, is it conceivable from all we know of the apostle's feelings, that he would have warned the disciples against such a practice as a dangerous snare to their souls, or raised a note of lamentation over those who had adopted it, as if all were nearly gone with them? Is there a single unbiassed reader of his epistles, who would not rather have expected him to rejoice in the thought of such a practical ascendency being won for the spiritual and eternal world, over the temporal and earthly? It is the less possible for any one to doubt this, when it is so manifest from his history, that he *did* make a distinction of days in this sense, by every where establishing the practice of religious meetings on the first day of the week, and exhorting the disciples to observe them aright. When he, therefore, writes against the observing of days, it must plainly be something of a different kind he has in view. And what could that be, but just the lazy, corporeal, outward observance of them, which the Jews had now come to regard as composing much of the very substance of religion, and by which they largely fed their self-righteous pride? Sabbath-days in this sense, it is certainly no part of the gospel to enforce; but neither was it any part of the law to do so; Moses, had he been alive, would have denounced them, as well as the ambassador of Christ.

But this, it may, perhaps, be thought scarcely reaches the point at issue; for the apostle discharges Christians from the observance of Sabbath-days, not in a false and improper sense, but in that

very sense in which they were shadows of good things to come—placing them on a footing in this respect with distinctions of meat and drink. It is needless to say here, that all the feast days of the Jews, being withdrawn from a common to a sacred use, were called Sabbaths, and that the apostle alludes exclusively to these.* There can be no doubt, indeed, that they were so called, and are also included here; but not to the exclusion of the seventh-day Sabbath, which, from the very nature of the case, was the one most likely to be thought of by the Colossians. Unless it had been expressly excepted, we must in fairness suppose it to have been at least equally intended with the others. But the truth is simply this: what the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath was not necessarily, or in itself, it came to acquire in the general apprehension from the connexion it had so long held with the symbolical services of Judaism. In its original institution there was nothing in it properly shadowy or typical of redemption; for it commenced before sin had entered, and while yet there was no need for a Redeemer. Nor was there any thing properly typical in the observance of it imposed in the fourth commandment; for this was just a substantial re-enforcement of the primary institution, only with a reference in the letter of the precept to the circumstances of Israel, as the destined possessors of Canaan. But becoming then associated with a symbolical religion, in which spiritual and divine things were constantly represented and taught by means of outward and bodily transactions, the bodily rest enjoined in it, came to partake of the common typical character of all their symbolical services. The same thing happened here, as with circumcision, which was the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant of grace, and had no immediate connexion with the law of Moses: while yet it became so identified with this law, that it required to be supplanted by another ordinance of precisely similar import, when the seed of blessing arrived, which the Abrahamic covenant chiefly respected. So great was the necessity for the abolition of the one ordinance, and the introduction of the other, that the apostle virtually declares it to have been indispensable, when he affirms those, who would still be circumcised, to be debtors to the whole law. At the same time, the original design and spiritual import of circumcision, he testifies to have been one and the same with baptism—calls baptism, indeed, the circumcision of Christ (Col. ii. 11,)—and, consequently, apart from the peculiar circumstances arising out of the general character of the Jewish religion, the one ordinance might have served the purpose contemplated as well as the other.

So with the Sabbath. Having been engrafted into a religion so peculiarly symbolical as the Mosaic, it was unavoidable, that

* This is Haldane's explanation in his appendix to his Com. on Romans, as it had also been that of Ridgely's and others in former times. But if that explanation were right—if the apostle really intended to except what the world at large pre-eminently understood by Sabbath-days it would be impossible to acquit him of using language almost sure to be misunderstood.

the bodily rest enjoined in it should acquire, like all the other outward things belonging to the religion, a symbolical and typical value. For that rest, though by no means the whole duty required, was yet the substratum and groundwork of the whole: the heart, when properly imbued with the religious spirit, feeling in this very rest a call to go forth and employ itself on God. To aid it in doing so, suitable exercises of various kinds would, doubtless, be commonly resorted to;* but not as a matter of distinct obligation, rather as a supplementary help to that quiet rest in God, and imitation of his doings, to which the day itself invited. This end is the same also which the gospel has in view, but which it seeks to accomplish by means of more active services and direct instruction. The end under both dispensations was substantially the same, with a characteristic difference as to the manner of attaining it, corresponding to the genius of the respective dispensations—the one making more of the outward, the other addressing itself to the inward man. Hence the mere outward, bodily rest of the Sabbath came, by a kind of unavoidable necessity, to acquire of itself a sacred character—although ultimately carried to an improper and unjustifiable excess, by the carnality of the Jewish mind. And hence too, when another state of things was introduced, it became necessary to assign to such Sabbaths a place among the things that were done away, and so far to change the ordinance itself as to transfer it to a different day, and even call it by a new name. But as baptism is Christ's circumcision, so the Lord's day is his Sabbath, and to be in the Spirit on that day, worshipping and serving him in the spirit of his gospel, is to take up the yoke of the fourth commandment.

5. This touches on, and partly answers, another objection—the only one of any moment that still remains to be adverted to—that derived from the change of day, from the last to the first day of the week. This was necessary, not only, as Horsley says,† to distinguish Christian from Jew, but also to distinguish Sabbath from Sabbath—a Sabbath growing up amid symbolical institutions, which deeply imbued it with a spirit of quiet repose, and a Sabbath not less marked, indeed, by a withdrawal from the cares and occupations of worldly business, but much more distinguished by spiritual employment and active energy, both in doing and receiving good. Such a change in its character was clearly indicated by our Lord, in those miracles of healing which he purposely performed on the Sabbath, that his followers might now see their calling, to use the opportunities presented to them on the day of bodily rest, to minister to the temporal or the spiritual necessities of those around them. And in fitting correspondence with this, the day chosen for the Christian Sabbath was the first day of the week—the day on which Christ rose from the

* 2 Kings iv. 23, where the Shunamite woman's husband expressed his wonder that she should go to the prophet, when it was neither new moon nor Sabbath, implies, that it was customary to meet for social exercises on these days.

† Works, vol. i. p. 356. The greater part of his three Sermons is excellent, though he does not altogether avoid, we think, some of the misapprehensions referred to above.

dead—that he might enter into the rest of God, after having finished the glorious work of redemption. But that rest, how to be employed? Not in vacant repose, but in an incessant, holy activity, in directing the affairs of his mediatorial kingdom, and diffusing the inestimable blessings he had purchased for men. A new era then dawned upon the world, which was to give an impulse, hitherto unknown, to all the springs of benevolent and holy working; and it was meet that this should communicate its impress to the day, through which the gospel was specially to develope its peculiar genius and proper tendency. But pre-eminent as this gospel stands above all earlier revelations of God, for the ascendency it gives to the unseen and eternal, over the seen and temporal, it would surely be a palpable contrariety to the whole spirit it breathes, and the ends it has in view, if now, on the Lord's day, the things of the world were to have more, and the things of God less, of men's regard than formerly on the Jewish Sabbath. Least of all could any change have been intended in this direction; and the only change in the manner of its observance, which the gospel itself warrants us to think of, is the greater amount of spiritual activity to be put forth on it, flowing out in suitable exercises of love to God, and acts of kindness and blessing toward our fellow-men.

What though the Gospel does not expressly enact this change of day, and in so many words enjoin the disciples to hallow the ordinances after the manner now described? It affords ample materials for every one gathering the mind of God in this respect, who is really anxious to learn it; and what more is done by it in regard to the ordinances of worship generally, or to any thing in God's service connected with external arrangements? It is the characteristic of the Gospel to unfold great truths and principles, and only briefly to indicate the proper manner of their development and exercise in the world. But can any one in reality have imbibed these, without cordially embracing, and to the utmost of his power improving, the advantages of such a wise and beneficent institution? Or, does the Christian world now not need its help, as much as the Jewish did of old? Even Tholuck, though he still does not see how to give the Christian Sabbath the right hold upon the conscience, yet deplores the prevailing neglect of it as destructive to the life of piety, and proclaims the necessity of a stricter observance. "Spirit, spirit! we cry out: but should the prophets of God come again, as they came of old, and should they look upon our works—Flesh, flesh! they would cry out in response. Of a truth, the most spiritual among us cannot dispense with a rule, a prescribed form, in his morality and piety, without allowing the flesh to resume its predominance. The sway of the Spirit of God in your minds is weak; carry, then, holy ordinances into your life."*

* Sermons, Bib. Cab. vol. xxviii. p. 13. The absolute necessity of a strict observance of the Lord's day to the life of religion, is well noted in a comparison between Scotland and Germany, by a shrewd and intelligent observer—Mr. Laing, in his notes on the Pilgrimage to Treves, ch. x. He does not profess to state the theological view of the subject, and even admits there may be some truth in what is sometimes pleaded for a looser observance of the day, especially in regard to those

It is not unimportant to state farther in regard to the change of day from the last to the first day of the week, that while strong reasons existed for it in the mighty change that had been introduced by the perfected redemption of Christ, no special stress appears, even in the Old Testament scripture, to have been laid on the precise day. Manifestly the succession of six days of worldly occupation, and one of sacred rest, is the point chiefly contemplated there. So little depended upon the exact day, that on the occasion of renewing the Sabbatical institution in the wilderness, the Lord seems to have made the weekly series run from the first giving of the manna. His example, therefore, in the work of creation, was intended merely to fix the relative proportion between the days of ordinary labour and those of sacred rest—and with that view is appealed to in the law. Nor, since redemption is to man a still more important work than creation, can it seem otherwise than befitting, to a sanctified mind, that such an alteration should have taken place in the relative position of the days, as might serve for a perpetual memorial, that this work also was now finished. How much more, when the alteration is known to have been made under the eye, and, doubtless, with the sanction of inspired authority!*

In conclusion, we deem the law of the Sabbath, as interpreted in this chapter, to have been fully entitled to a place in the standing revelation of God's will concerning man's duty, and to have formed no exception to the perfection and completeness of the law:—

(1.) Because, first, there is in such an institution, when properly observed, a sublime act of holiness. The whole rational creation standing still, as it were, on every seventh day as it returns, and looking up to its God—what could more strikingly proclaim, in all men's ears, that they have a common Lord and master in heaven? It reminds the rich, that what they have is not properly their own —that they hold all of a superior—a superior who demands that on this day the meanest slave shall be as his master—nay, that the very beast of the field shall be loosed from its yoke of service, and stand free to its Creator. No wonder that proud man, who

situated in large towns—but still holds the necessity of a well-spent Sabbath to produce and maintain a due sense of religion, and attributes the low state of religion in Germany very much to their neglect of the Sabbath. He justly says, the strict observance of Sunday "is the application of principle to practice by a whole people; it is the working of their religious sense and knowledge upon their habits; it is the sacrifice of pleasures, in themselves innocent, and these are the most difficult to be sacrificed, to a higher principle than self-indulgence; such a population stands on a much higher moral and intellectual step than the population of the Continent," &c.

* Professor Lee of Cambridge, in his Dissertations (i. s. 11,) enters into some statements to show that the Sabbath appointed to the Israelites was in reality the sixth day of the week, and not the seventh, which the patriarchs had observed, and that when again changed to the first at Christ's resurrection, the primitive and patriarchal institution was literally restored. We are not satisfied with the proof adduced; and we should attach no importance to the point if it were proved. It is plain, scripture does not, otherwise more would have been said on it; and, indeed, the main argument is weakened rather than strengthened, by going into such minuteness, and pressing the exact day.

loves to do what he will with his own, and that the busy world, which is bent on prosecuting with restless activity the concerns of time, would fain break asunder the bands of this holy institution. For it speaks aloud of the overruling dominion and rightful supremacy of God, which they would willingly cast behind their backs. But the heart that is indeed charged with the principles of the gospel, how can it fail to call such a day the holy of the Lord and honourable? Loving God, it cannot but love what gives it the opportunity of holding such near communion with him.

(2.) Secondly, because it is an institution of mercy. In perfect harmony with the gospel it breathes good-will and kindness to men. It brings, as Coleridge well expressed it, fifty-two spring days every year to this toilsome world; and may justly be regarded as a sweet remnant of Paradise, mitigating the now inevitable burdens of life, and connecting the region of bliss that has been lost, with the still brighter glory that is to come. As in the former aspect there is love to God, so here there is love to man.

(3.) Lastly, we uphold its title to a place in the permanent revelation of God's will to man, because of its eminent use, and absolute necessity to promote men's higher interests. Religion cannot properly exist without it, and is always found to thrive as the spiritual duties of the day of God are attended to and discharged. It is, when duly improved, the parent and the guardian of every virtue. In this practical aspect of it, all men of serious piety substantially concur; and as a specimen of thousands, which might be produced, we conclude with simply giving the impressive testimony of Owen: "For my part, I must not only say, but plead, whilst I live in this world, and leave this testimony to the present and future ages, that if ever I have seen any thing of the ways and worship of God, wherein the power of religion or godliness hath been expressed; any thing that hath represented the holiness of the gospel and the Author of it; any thing that looked like a prelude to the everlasting Sabbath and rest with God, which we aim, through grace, to come unto, it hath been there, and with them, where, and among whom, the Lord's day hath been held in highest esteem, and a strict observation of it attended to, as an ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ. The remembrance of their ministry, their walk and conversation, their faith and love, who in this nation have most zealously pleaded for, and have been in their persons, families, parishes, or churches, the most strict observers of this day—will be precious to them that fear the Lord, whilst the sun and moon endure. Let these things be despised by those who are otherwise minded; to me they are of great weight and importance."

CHAPTER IV.

WHAT THE LAW COULD NOT DO—THE COVENANT-STANDING AND PRIVILEGES OF ISRAEL BEFORE IT WAS GIVEN.

HAVING now considered what the law, properly so called, was in itself, we proceed to inquire into the ends and purposes for which it was given, and the precise place which it was designed to hold in the divine economy. Any misapprehension entertained, or even any obscurity allowed to hang upon these points, would, it is plain, materially affect the issue of our future investigations. And there is the more need to be careful and discriminating in our inquiries here, as from the general and deep-rooted carnality of the Jewish people, the effect which the law actually produced upon the character of their religion was to a considerable extent different from what it ought to have been. This error on their part has also mainly contributed to the first rise and still continued existence of some mistaken views regarding the law among many Christian divines.

There can be no doubt, that the law held relatively a different place under the Old dispensation, from what it does under the New. The most superficial acquaintance with the statements of New Testament scripture on the subject, is enough to satisfy us of this. "The law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." But there is one point—the first that properly meets us in this department of our subject—in regard to which both dispensations are entirely on a footing. This point has respect to the *condition* of those to whom the law was given, and which, being already possessed, the law could not possibly have been intended to bring. So that an inquiry into the nature of that condition of necessity carries along with it the consideration of what the law could not do.

Now, as the historical element is here of importance, when was it, we ask, that this revelation of law was given to Israel? Somewhere, we are told, about the beginning of the third month after their departure from the land of Egypt, (Ex. xix. 1.) Hence, from the very period of its introduction, the law could not come as a redeemer from evil, or a bestower of life and blessing. Its object could not possibly be to propose any thing which should have the effect of shielding from death, rescuing from bondage, or founding a title to the favour and blessing of Heaven, for all that had been already obtained. By God's outstretched arm, working with sovereign freedom and almighty power in behalf of the Israelites, they had been brought into a state of freedom and enlargement, and under the banner of divine protection were travelling to the land settled on them as an inheritance, before one word had been spoken to them of the law in the proper sense of the term. And what-

ever purposes the law might have been intended to serve, it could not have been for any of those already accomplished or provided for.

It is of great importance to keep distinctly in view this *negative* side of the law—what it neither could, nor was ever designed to do. For, if we raise it to a position which it was not meant to occupy, and expect from it benefits which it was not fitted to yield, we must be altogether at fault in our reckoning, and can have no clear knowledge of the dispensation to which it belonged. It is in reference to this, that the apostle speaks in Gal. iii. 17, 18: "And this I say, that the covenant, which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise." The Jews had come in the apostle's time, and most of them, indeed, long before, to look to their deeds of law as constituting their title to the inheritance; and the same leaven of self-righteousness was now beginning to work among the Galatian converts. To check this tendency in them, and convince them of the fundamental error on which it proceeded, he presses on their consideration the nature and design of God's covenant with Abraham, which he represents as having been "confirmed before of God in Christ," because in making promise of a seed of blessing, it had respect pre-eminently to Christ, and might justly be regarded, in its leading objects and provisions, as only an earlier and imperfect exhibition of the Christian covenant of redemption. But that covenant expressly conferred on Abraham's posterity, as Heaven's free gift, the inheritance of the land of Canaan; and it must also have secured their redemption from the house of bondage, and their safe conduct through the wilderness, since these were necessary to their entering on the possession of the inheritance. Hence, as the apostle argues, their title to these things could not possibly need to be acquired over again by deeds of law afterwards performed, for this would manifestly have been to give to the law the power of disannulling the covenant of promise, and would have made one revelation of God overthrow the foundation already laid by another.

But that God never meant the law to interfere with the gifts and promises of the covenant, is clear from what he said to the children of the covenant immediately before the law was given: "Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." Here God addresses them as already standing in such a relation of nearness to him, as secured for them an interest in his faithfulness and love. He appeals to the proofs, which he had given of this, as amply sufficient to dispel every doubt from their mind, and to warrant them in expecting whatever might still be needed to com-

plete their felicity. "Now *therefore* if ye will obey my voice"—not because ye have obeyed it, have the great things which have just been accomplished in your experience taken place, but these have been done that you might feel your calling to obey, and by obeying fulfil the high destiny to which you are appointed. In this call to obedience we already have the whole law, so far as concerns the ground of its obligation, and the germ of its requirements. And when the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai, to proclaim the words of the law, he is simply to be regarded as giving utterance to that voice which they were to obey. Hence also, in prefacing the words then spoken by the declaration, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," he rests his claim to their obedience on precisely the same ground that he does here; he resumes what he had previously said in regard to the peculiar relation in which he stood to them, as proved by the grand deliverance he had achieved in their behalf, and on that founds his special claim to the return of dutiful obedience, which he justly expected at their hands. And when it was proclaimed as the result of this obedience, that they would be to God "a peculiar people, a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation," they were given to understand, that thus alone could they continue to occupy the singular place they now held in the regard of Heaven, enjoy intimate fellowship with God, and be fitting instruments in his hand for carrying out the wise and holy purposes of his divine government. This, however, belongs to another part of the subject, and has respect to what the law *was* given to do.

We see, then, from the very time and manner in which the law was introduced, that it could not have been designed to interfere with the covenant of promise; and as all that pertained to redemption, the inheritance, and the means of life and blessing, came by that covenant, the law was manifestly given to provide none of them. Nor could it make any alteration on the law in this respect, that it was made to assume the form of a covenant. Why this was done, we shall inquire in the sequel. But looking at the matter still, in a merely negative point of view, it is obvious that the law coming to possess the character of a covenant could give it no power to make void the provisions of that earlier covenant, which secured for the seed of Abraham, as Heaven's free gift, the inheritance and every thing properly belonging to it. And if the Israelites should at any time come to regard the covenant of law as having been made for the purpose of founding a title to what the covenant with Abraham had previously bestowed, they would evidently misinterpret the meaning of God, and confound the proper relations of things. This, however, is what they actually did on a large scale, and the grievous error and pernicious consequences of which are pointed out in Gal. iv. 21—31: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he, who was of the bond woman, was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which

things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants, the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar. For this Hagar is (i. e. corresponds to) Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem, which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, (Isa. liv. 1,) Rejoice, thou barren, that bearest not, break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she that hath a husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise," &c.

Here the proper wife of Abraham, Sarah, and his bondmaid Hagar, are viewed as the representatives of the two covenants respectively, and the children of the two mothers, as, in like manner, representatives of the kind of worshippers whom the covenants were fitted to produce. Sarah, the only proper spouse of Abraham, stands for the heavenly Jerusalem; that is, the true church of God, in which he perpetually resides, and begets children to himself. Whoever belong to it are born from above, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." And that Sarah's son might be the fit representative of all such, his birth was delayed till she had attained an advanced age. Born as Isaac was, it was impossible to overlook the immediate and supernatural operation of God's hand in his birth; and if ever mother had reason to say, "I have gotten a man from the Lord," it was Sarah when she brought forth Isaac. But what was true of Isaac's *natural* birth, is equally true of the *spiritual* birth of God's people in every age; the church, as a heavenly society, is their mother; but that church, simply because she is the habitation of God, and the channel through which his grace flowing into the dead heart of nature, quickens it into newness of life. And the covenant in the hand of this church, by which she is empowered to bring forth such children to God, must be substantially the same in every age; viz.: the covenant of grace, which began to be disclosed in part on the very scene of the fall—which was again more distinctly revealed to Abraham, when he received the promises of a seed of blessing, and an inheritance of good, and which has been clearly brought to light, and finally confirmed in Christ for the whole elect family of God. This unquestionably is the covenant which answers to Sarah, and belongs to the heavenly Jerusalem; to this covenant all the real children of God owe their birth, their privileges, and their hopes: those who are born of it, in whatever age of the church, are born in freedom, and heirs of the inheritance.

It is this church, standing in and growing out of this covenant, that the prophet Isaiah addresses, in the passage quoted by the apostle, as a "barren woman, a widow, and desolate," and whom he comforts with the promise of a numerous offspring. He does not expressly name Sarah, but he evidently has her in his eye, and draws his delineation both of the present and the future in language suggested by her history. For, as in her case, so the seed of the true church was long in coming, and slow of increase, com-

pared with those born after the flesh. It seemed often, especially in such times of backsliding and desolation as those contemplated by the prophet, as if the spouse were absolutely forsaken, or utterly incapable of being a mother, and she appeared all the more in need of consolation, as her carnal rival even then possessed a large and numerous offspring. But the prophet cheers her with the prospect of better days to come; and gives her the assurance, that, in the long run, her spiritual seed would greatly outnumber the fleshly seed of the other. This prospect began, (as the apostle intimates v. 31,) to be more especially realized, when the kingdom opened the door of salvation to the Gentiles.

The other covenant, which answers to Hagar, was the covenant of law ratified at Sinai; but that by no means corresponding, as is often represented, to the Old Testament church or dispensation. For viewed in the light of mothers, the two covenants are spoken of as directly opposite in their nature, tendency, and effects, while the Old and New Testament dispensations present no such contrast to each other. They are rather to be regarded as in all essential respects the same. They differ, not as Ishmael differed from Isaac, but only as the heir, when a child, differs from the heir when arrived at maturity. Of all the true members of both churches, Abraham is the common parent and head; and whether outwardly descended from his loins or not, they constitute properly but one people. They are all the children of faithful Abraham, possessing his covenant-relation to God, and his interest in the promises of good things to come, (Rom. iv. 11—13; Gal. iii. 29.) But the seed that came by Hagar, which was born, not properly of God, but of the will of the flesh, was entirely of another kind, and represented no part of the true church in any age; it represented only the carnal portion of the professing church—the unregenerate, idolatrous, or self-righteous Israelites of former times, who deemed it quite enough that they were able to trace their descent from Abraham—and the merely nominal believers now, who satisfy themselves with an outward standing among the followers of Jesus, and a formal attendance on some of the ordinances of his appointment. These are they, "who say they are Jews, but are not;" they no more belonged to the seed of God, under the Old Testament, than they do under the New; they are Ishmaelites, not Israelites—a spurious, fleshly offspring, that should never have been born, and when born, without any title to the inheritance and the blessing.

It was the prevailing delusion of the Jews in our Lord's time, as it had been also of many former times, not to perceive this—not to understand, what yet God had taken especial pains to teach them, that the subjects of his love and blessing were always an elect seed. From the time of Abraham, they had chiefly belonged to his stock, but never had they at any period embraced all his offspring:—not the sons of Hagar and Keturah, but only the son of Sarah; not both the sons of Isaac, but only Jacob; not all the sons of Jacob, but only such as possessed his faith, and were, like him, princes with God. The principle, "not all Israel, who are of Israel,"

runs through the entire history; and too often also do the facts of history afford ground for the conclusion, that those who were simply of Israel, had greatly the preponderance in numbers and influence over such as truly were Israel.

But how did such children come to exist at all? How did they get a being within the bosom of the church of God? They also had a mother, represented by Hagar, and that mother, as well as the other, a covenant of God, the covenant of Sinai. But why should it have produced such children? In one way alone could it possibly have done so; viz., by being put out of its proper place, and turned to an illegitimate use. God never designed it to be a mother at all; no more than Hagar, respecting whom Abraham sinned, when he turned aside to her, and took her for a mother of children; her proper place was that only of a handmaid to Sarah. And it was, in like manner, to pervert the covenant of law from Sinai to an improper purpose, to look to it as a parent of life and blessing; nor could any better result come from the error. "It gendereth unto bondage," says the apostle; that is, in so far as it gave birth to any children, these were not true children of God, free, spiritual, with hearts of filial confidence and devoted love; but miserable bondmen, selfish, carnal, full of mistrust and fear. Of these children of the Sinaitic covenant we are presented with a finished specimen in the Scribes and Pharisees of our Lord's time—men, who were chiefly remarkable for the full and ripened development of a spirit of bondage in religion—who were complete in all the garniture of a sanctified demeanour, while they were full within of ravening and wickedness—worshipping a God, whom they eyed only as the taskmaster of a laborious ritual, by the punctual observance of which they counted themselves secure of his favour and blessing—crouching, like slaves, beneath their yoke of bondage, and loving the very bonds that lay on them, because nothing higher than the abject and hireling spirit of slavery breathed in their hearts. Such were the children, whom the covenant of law produced, as its natural and proper offspring. But did God ever seek such children? Could he own them as members of his kingdom? or receive them to an interest in his promised blessings? Assuredly not; and therefore it was entirely against his mind, when his professing people looked in that direction for life and blessing; if really his people, they already had these by another and earlier covenant which *could* give them; and those who still looked for them to the covenant of law, only got a serpent for bread, instead of a blessing a curse.*

It seems very strange, that so many Christian divines, especially of such as hold evangelical principles, should here have fallen into substantially the Jewish error, representing the Israelites as being

* On this negative side of the law, see Bell on the Covenants, which, though full of repetition, is clear and satisfactory on this part of the subject; it forms a sort of expanded, and certainly rather tedious illustration of Vitringa's Com. on Isa. liv. l. On the positive side of the law, or what it was designed to do, the work is not quite so successful.

in such a sense under the covenant of law, that by obedience to it they had to establish their title to the inheritance. Not only does Warburton call the dispensation under which they were placed roundly "a dispensation of works,"* but we find Dr. John Erskine, among many similar things, writing thus: "He, who yielded an external obedience to the law of Moses, was termed *righteous*, and had a claim, in virtue of his obedience, to the land of Canaan, so that doing these things he lived by them. Hence Moses says, Deut. v. 25, it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God; that is, it shall be the cause and matter of our justification, it shall found our title to covenant blessings. But to spiritual and heavenly blessings we are entitled by the obedience of the Son of God, not by our own."† It was very necessary, when the learned author made obedience to the covenant of Sinai the ground of a title to the inheritance of Canaan, that he should bring down its terms as low as possible; for had these not been of a superficial and easy nature, it would manifestly have been a mockery to make the people's obedience the ground of their title. But what, then, becomes of the covenant with Abraham, if the inheritance, which it gave freely in promise to his seed, had to be acquired over again by deeds of law? And what, indeed, becomes of the spiritual and unchangeable character of God, if in one age of the church, he should appear to have exacted duties of an external kind, as the ground of a title to his blessing, while in another all is given of grace, and the duties required are pre-eminently inward and spiritual? In such a case, there not only could have been no proper correspondence bebetween the earlier and the later dispensations, but the revealed character of God must have undergone an essential change; he could not be "the Jehovah that changeth not." The confusion arises from assigning to the covenant of law a wrong place, and ascribing to it what it was never intended to do or give. "God did never make a new promulgation of the law by revelation to sinful men, in order to keep them under mere law, without setting before them, at the same time, the promise and grace of the new covenant, by which they might escape from the curse which the law denounced. The legal and evangelical dispensations have been but different dispensations of the same covenant of grace, and of the blessings thereof. Though there is now a greater degree of light, consolation, and liberty, yet if Christians are now under a kingdom of grace, where there is pardon upon repentance, the Lord's people under the Old Testament were (as to the reality and substance of things) also under a kingdom of grace."‡ So that it is quite wrong, as the judicious author states, to represent those "who were under the pedagogy of the law, as if they had been under a proper and strict covenant of works."

Baehr, who rises immeasurably above all who have imbibed their

* Div. Leg. B. v. Note C.
† Theological Dissertations, p. 44.
‡ Fraser on Sanctification; Explic. of Rom. vii. 8.

notions of the legal dispensation in the school of Spencer and Warburton, and who every where exhibits a due appreciation of the moral and religious element in Judaism, still so far coincides with them, that he elevates the law to a place not properly its own. After investigating the descriptions given of the decalogue, he draws the conclusion, that "for Israel this formed the foundation of its whole existence as a people, the root of its religious and political life, the highest, best, most precious thing the people had, their one and all."* So also again, when speaking of the covenant and the law being entirely the same, he says to the like effect: "This covenant first properly gave Israel as a people its being; it was the root and basis of the life of Israel as a people."† No doubt understanding, as he does, by the law or covenant all the precepts and institutions of Moses, which he holds to have been represented in the decalogue, the idea here expressed is not quite so wide of the truth as it might otherwise appear. But still we deem it a most erroneous statement, utterly at variance with the facts of Israel's history, and calculated to give a false impression of the whole nature and design of the Mosaic legislation. It presents this to our view simply as a dispensation of works, having law for the root of life, and consequently the deeds of law for the only ground of blessing. In plain contrariety to the assertion of the apostle,‡ it virtually says, a law *was* given, which brought life, and that righteousness was by the law. Finally, it gives such a place to the mere requirements and operations of law, that nothing remained for grace to do, but merely to pardon the shortcomings and transgressions of which men might be guilty, as subject to law; all else was earned by the obedience performed; even forgiveness itself in a manner was thus earned, because obtained as the result of services rendered in compliance with the terms and prescriptions of law.

This glorification of law, however, has not been confined to the Old Testament church. There are not a few Christian divines who are so enamoured of law, that the gospel of the grace of God, has become in their hands only a kind of modified covenant of works; and they can only account for faith holding the peculiar place assigned to it in the work of salvation, because in their view it comprehends all graces and virtues in its bosom. Salvation appears not directly and properly as the free gift of divine grace in Christ, but rather as the acquired result of man's evangelical righteousness, or, as it is generally termed, his sincere though imperfect obedience. The title to heaven must still be earned, only the satisfaction of Christ has secured its being done on much easier conditions. There is no need for our entering into any exposure of this New Testament legalism, as we have seen that its prototype under the Old Testament, though it had more seemingly to countenance it, was still without any proper foundation. But we may briefly advert to the statements of another class of theo-

* Symbolik, i. 386, 387. † Ib. ii. p. 389. ‡ Gal. iii. 21.

logians, who, while they admit that the Old, as well as the New Testament church, was under a dispensation of grace, to which it owed all its privileges, blessings, and hopes, at the same time regard the covenant of Sinai as in itself properly the covenant of works, by obedience to which, if faithfully and fully rendered, men would have founded a title to life and blessing. They justly regard it as in substance a republication of the law of holiness originally impressed upon the soul of Adam; but fall into perplexity and confusion by adopting a somewhat erroneous view of the primary design and object of that law. The righteousness there required they are accustomed to represent as that "by the doing of which man was to found his right to promised blessings;"* or, to use the language of another, "in virtue of which he might thereon plead and demand the reward of eternal life."† Then, viewing such a law or covenant of works in reference to men as sinful, the works required in it are necessarily considered as "the condition of a sinner's justification and acceptance with God," "a law to be done that he might be saved."‡

But was a law ever given, or a covenant ever made with man with any such professed design? Was it even propounded thus to Adam in paradise? Had he not received, as a free gift from the hand of God, before any thing was exacted of him in the way of obedience, both the principle of a divine life and an inheritance of blessing? So far from needing to found by deeds of righteousness a title to these, he came forth at the very first fully fraught with them; and the question with him was, not how to obtain what he had not, but how to continue in the enjoyment of what he already possessed. This he could no otherwise do than by fulfilling the righteous ends for which he had been created. To direct him towards these, therefore, must have been the sole object of whatever law was outwardly proposed to him, or inwardly impressed upon his conscience. If the word to him might be said to be, "Do this and live," it could only be in the sense of his thereby continuing in the life, in the possession and blessedness of which he was created. And it was the fond conceit of the Pharisaical Jews, that their law was given for purposes, higher even than those for which any law was given to man in innocence; that they might, by obedience to law, work out a righteousness, and acquire a title to life and glory, which did not naturally belong to them. It is simply against this groundless and perverse notion, which had come latterly to diffuse its leaven through the whole Jewish mind, that our Lord and his apostles are to be understood as speaking, when in a manifold variety of ways they endeavour to withdraw men's regards from the law, as a source of life, and point them to the riches of divine grace.§

* Bell on Covenants, p. 198.

† Boston's Notes on Marrow of Modern Divinity, p. 1, Introd.

‡ Ib. p. 1, c. 1, and the Marrow itself there; also Fraser on Rom. vii. 4.

§ Rom. iii. vii.; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7; Gal. iii. 11, 21; Phil. iii. 8, 9; Eph. i. 3, 7; Tit. iii. 4, 7; 1 John i. v. 11; also of our Lord's Discourses, Luke xv.; xix. 1, 10; John iii. 16, 18; vi. 51. When he directed the lawyer, who tempted him with the ques-

It is, then, carefully to be remembered, in regard to the Old Testament church, that she had two covenants connected with her constitution,—a covenant of grace, as well as of law; and that the covenant of law, as it came last, so it took for granted the provisions of the existing covenant of grace. It was grafted upon this, and grew out of it. Hence, in revealing the terms of the legal covenant, the Lord spake to the Israelites as already *their* God, from whom they had received life and freedom (Ex. xx. 2,)—proclaimed himself as the God of mercy, as well as of holiness (v. 5, 6,)—recognised their title to the inheritance as his own sovereign gift to them (v. 12,)—thus making it clear to all, that the covenant of law raised itself on the ground of the previous covenant of grace, and sought to carry out this to its legitimate and fruitful results.*

That this also is the order of God's procedure with men under the gospel, nothing but the most prejudiced mind can fail to perceive. Every where does God there present himself to his people as in the first instance a giver of life and blessing, and only afterwards as an exacter of obedience to his commands. Their obedience, so far from entitling to salvation, can never be acceptably rendered, till they have become partakers of the blessings of salvation. These blessings are altogether of grace, and are, therefore, received through faith. For what is faith, but the acceptance of Heaven's grant of salvation, or a trusting in the record in which the grant is conveyed? So that, in the order of each man's experience, there must, as is fully brought out in the epistle to the Romans, first be a participation in the mercies of God, and then growing out of this a felt and constraining obligation to run the way of God's commandments. How can it, indeed, be otherwise? How were it possible for men, laden with sin, and underlying the condemnation of Heaven, to earn any thing at God's hands, or do what might seem good in his sight, till they become partakers of grace? Can they work up so far, at least, against the stream of his displeasure, and begin of themselves the process of recovery,

tion, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" to the commandments of the law and in reference to the perfect love there required to God and man, said, "This do and thou shalt live;" it is clear he merely met the inquirer on his own ground, and aimed at sending him away with an impression of the impossibility of obtaining life by perfecting himself in the law's requirements. So also, such expressions as that in Rom. vii. 10, of "the commandment being ordained to life," (lit. which was for or unto life,) cannot mean that it was given to confer life, or to show the way of attaining it, for this is denied of any law that either was or could be given, Gal. iii. 21. It simply means, that the law was given to subserve or promote the purposes of God in respect to life.

* The relation between the two covenants is briefly, but correctly stated by Sack in his Apologetik, p. 179: "The matter of the law is altogether grounded upon the covenant of promise made with Abraham.... The law neither could nor would withdraw the exercise of faith from the covenant of promise, or render that superfluous, but merely formed an intermediate provision, until the fulfilment came." The relation is seldom correctly made out by writers of the class last referred to. For example, Boston would have the two covenants to have been revealed simultaneously from Sinai, making the Sinaitic covenant as much a covenant of grace as of law, (on the Marrow, p. 1, c. 2.) Burgess, (on Moral Law and Covenants, p. 224,) represents it as properly a covenant of grace.

which they only require him to perfect? To imagine the possibility of this, were to betray our utter ignorance of the character of God in reference to his dealings with the guilty. He can, for his Son's sake, bestow eternal life and blessing on the most unworthy, but he cannot stoop to treat and bargain with men about their acquiring a title to it through their own imperfect services. They must first receive the gift through the channel of his own providing; and only when they have done this, are they in a condition to please and honour him. Not more certainly is faith without works dead, than all works are dead which do not spring from the living root of faith already implanted in the heart.

CHAPTER V.

THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE LAW WAS GIVEN, AND THE CONNEXION BETWEEN IT AND THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS.

We proceed now to advance a step farther, and to consider what the law *was* designed to do for Israel. That it did not come with a hostile intent, we have already seen. Its object was not to disannul the covenant of promise, or to found a new title to gifts and blessings already conferred. It was given rather as a handmaid to the covenant, to minister in an inferior, but still necessary place, to the higher ends and purposes which the covenant itself had in view. And hence, when considered as standing in that its proper place, it is fitly regarded as an additional proof of the goodness of God toward his people: "He made known his ways unto Moses, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any people."

1. The first and immediate purpose for which the law was given to Israel, was that it might serve as a revelation of the righteousness which God expected from them as his covenant-people in the land of their inheritance. It was for this inheritance they had been redeemed. They were God's own peculiar people, his children and heirs, proceeding, under the banner of his covenant, to occupy *his* land. And that they might know the high ends for which they were to be planted there, and how these ends were to be secured, the Lord took them aside by the way, and gave them this revelation of his righteousness. As the land of their inheritance was emphatically God's land, so the law, which was to reign paramount there, must of necessity be his law, and that law itself the manifestation of his righteousness. With no other view, could God have stretched out his hand to redeem a people to himself, and with no other testimony set them as his witnesses before the eye of the world, on a territory peculiarly his own. He must have acted here in the highest sense for his own glory; and as his glory,

in what concerns his moral government, is just the complete and perfect manifestation of his righteousness, so those whom he destined to be the chosen instruments for showing forth his glory in the region prepared for them, must go thither with the revelation of his righteousness in their hand, as the law which they were to carry out into all the relations of public and private life.

The same thing might be said in this respect of the land as a whole, which the Psalmist declares in reference to its most select spot—the place on which the tabernacle was pitched: "Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart." (Ps. xv.) And again in Psalm xxiv., "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, and who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully." There can be no doubt, that the character here meant to be delineated, is that of the true servants of God, as contra-distinguished from hypocrites—the real denizens of his kingdom, whose high distinction it was to be dwellers and sojourners with him. The going up to the hill of God, standing in his holy place, or abiding in his tabernacle, is merely an image to express this spiritual idea. The land as a whole being God's land, the people as a whole should also have been found dwelling as guests, or sojourning with him. (Lev. xxv. 23.) But this they could only be in reality, the Psalmist means to say, if they possessed the righteous character he delineates. In both of the delineations he gives, it is impossible to overlook a manifest reference to the decalogue; and that such delineations should have been given at a time when the tabernacle service was in the course of being set up anew with increased splendour, was plainly designed to sound a warning in the ears of the people, that whatever regard should be paid to this, it was still the righteousness in thought, word, and deed, as required in the precepts of the decalogue, which God pre-eminently sought. This was what peculiarly fitted them for the place they occupied, and the destiny they had to fill. Hence, not only the righteousness of the decalogue in general, but that especially of the second table is made prominent in the description, because hypocrites have so many ways of counterfeiting the works of the first table.*

It marks no essential alteration on the law in this point of view, that it was confirmed into a covenant. For what sort of covenant was it? And with what object ratified? Not as an independent and separate revelation; but only, as already stated, a handmaid to the previously existing covenant of promise. On this last, as the divine root of all life and blessing, it was grafted; and rising from the ground which that former covenant provided, it proceeded to develope the requirements of righteousness, which the members of the covenant ought to have fulfilled. It was merely to impart greater solemnity to this revelation of righteousness—to give

* See Hengstenberg and Calvin on Ps. xv. 2.

to its calls of duty a deeper impression and firmer hold upon the conscience—to render it clear and palpable, that the things required in it were not of loose and uncertain, but of most sure and indispensable obligation,—it was for such reasons alone that the law was confirmed into a covenant. By this most sacred of religious transactions the Israelites were taken bound as a people to aim continually at the fulfilment of its precepts. But its being made the matter of a covenant did not raise it into any other character than that of a rule of life and conduct, or materially affect the issues that sprung either from obedience or disobedience to its demands; nor was any effect contemplated besides that of strengthening its moral weight and felt obligation upon the conscience. And the very circumstance of its being constituted the terms of a covenant, having God in the relation of a Redeemer for one of the contracting parties, was fraught with comfort and encouragement; for the people were thus assured, that what God in his covenant of law required them to do, the same God in his covenant of promise stood pledged with his divine help to aid them in performing; the blood of the covenant as much bound God to bestow the one, as it bound them to render the other; so that while there was in this transaction something fitted to lighten, rather than to aggravate, the burden of the law's yoke, there was, at the same time, what involved the necessity of compliance with the tenor of its requirements, and took away all excuse from the wilfully disobedient.

The sum of the matter, then, was this: The seed of Abraham, as God's acknowledged children and heirs, were going to receive for their possession the land which he claimed for his peculiar inheritance; but they must go and abide there possessors also of his character of holiness, for thus alone could they either glorify his name, or enjoy his blessing; and, therefore, he would not suffer them to plant their foot within its sacred precincts, until he had disclosed to them the great lines of religious and moral duty, in which the resemblance most essentially stands, to his character of holiness, and taken them bound by the most solemn engagement to have the lovely pattern of excellence set before them, as far as possible, realized in practice, through all the dwellings of Canaan. Had they been but faithful to their engagement—had they as a people striven in earnest through the grace offered them in the one covenant to exemplify the character of the righteous man exhibited in the other, "delighting in the law of the Lord, and meditating therein day and night," then in their condition they would assuredly have been "like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season, whose leaf doth not wither, and whatsoever he doth prospereth." Canaan would then, indeed, have verified the description of a land flowing with milk and honey.

We thus see in the *immediate* purposes of God respecting Israel, a sufficient reason for the introduction of the law, and for the prominent place assigned to it in the divine dispensation. But if we connect the immediate with the *ultimate* design of God in this portion of his dealings, we see the absolute necessity of what was done,

in order to make the past a faithful representation of the future. Canaan stood to the eye of faith the type of heaven; and the character and condition of its inhabitants should have presented the image of what theirs shall be, who have entered on the kingdom prepared for them before the foundation of the world. The condition of such, we are well assured, shall be all blessedness and glory; the region of their inheritance shall be Immanuel's land—where the vicissitudes of evil, and the pangs of suffering, shall be alike unknown—where every thing shall reflect the effulgent glory of its divine Author, and streams of purest delight shall be ever flowing to satisfy the souls of the redeemed. But it is never to be forgotten, that their condition shall be thus replenished with all that is attractive and good, just because their character shall first have become perfect in holiness; no otherwise than as conformed to Christ's image can they share with him in his inheritance; for the kingdom of which they are the destined heirs, is one which the unrighteous cannot inherit, nor shall corruption in any form or degree be permitted to dwell in it; "its people shall be all righteous"—that is their first characteristic, and the second depending upon this, and growing out of it as a certain result, is, that they shall be all filled with the goodness and glory of the Lord.

Hence, in addition to the moral ends of a direct and immediate kind which required to be accomplished, it was necessary also, in this point of view, to make the experience of God's ancient people, in connexion with the land of promise, turn upon their relation to the law. As he could not permit them to enter the inheritance without first placing them under the discipline of the law, so neither could he permit them afterwards to enjoy the good of the land, when they lived in neglect of the righteousness the law required. In both respects, the type became sadly marred in the event, and the image it presented of the coming realities of heaven was to be seen only in occasional lines and broken fragments. The people were so far from being all righteous, that they too often hardened their hearts in sin; on *their* part, a false representation was given of the future world; and it was in the highest degree impossible that God could countenance their backsliding so as to make the representation equally false on *his* part. He must of necessity trouble the condition and change the lot of his people, in proportion as sin obtained a footing among them; the less there was of heaven's righteousness in their character, the less always must there be of its blessedness and glory in their condition;—until, at last, the Lord was constrained to say: "Because they have forsaken my law, which I set before them, and have not obeyed my voice, neither walked therein, but have walked after the imagination of their own heart; therefore, thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold I will feed them with wormwood, and give them water of gall to drink; I will scatter them also among the heathen, and will send a sword after them, till I have consumed them."* Such were the imperfections of the type; let us rejoice,

* Jer. ix. 13—16.

that in the antitype such imperfections can have no place; all there stands firm and secure in the unchanging faithfulness of Jehovah, and it will be as impossible for sin, as for adversity and trouble, to enter into the heavenly Canaan.

We shall only remark further, concerning what we have assigned as the primary reason for the giving of the law, that it is the one chiefly indicated by the apostle in Gal. iii. 19: "Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." The meaning is, it was added to the provisions and blessings secured in the earlier covenant of promise, because of the disposition in the hearts of the people to run out into transgression. To check this disposition—to keep their minds under the discipline of a severe and holy restraint—and circumscribe and limit their way, so that no excuse or liberty would be left them to turn aside from the right path—for this reason the law was added to the covenant. *But* for that inherent proneness to sin, there should have been no need for such an addition. Had the members of the covenant thoroughly imbibed its spirit, and responded as they should have done to the love God had manifested toward them in making good its provisions, they would of themselves have been inclined to do the things which were contained in the law. This, however, they were not; and hence the law took so much of the prohibitory form, being the revelation of God's righteousness as opposed to the prevailing current of man's sinful and corrupt propensities. It was to these propensities alone that the law carried a hostile and frowning aspect; in respect to the people themselves, it came as a minister of good, and not of evil; and so far from being opposed to the promises of the covenant, it was rather to be viewed as a friendly monitor and guide, directing the people how to continue in the blessing of the covenant, and fulfil the ends for which it was ratified.

2. There was, however, another great reason for the law being given, which is also, perhaps, alluded to by the apostle in the passage just noticed, when he limits the use of the law in reference to transgressions, to the period before Christ's appearance. Christ was to be pre-eminently the seed of promise, through whom the blessings of the covenant were to be secured; and when he should come, as a more perfect state of things would then be introduced, the law would no longer be required as it was before. While, therefore, it had an immediate and direct purpose to serve in restraining the innate tendency to transgression, it might be said to have had the further end in view of preparing the minds of men for that coming seed. And this it was fitted to do precisely through the same property, which rendered it suitable for accomplishing the primary design, viz. the perfect revelation it gave of the righteousness of God. It brought the people into contact with the holy character of God, binding them by covenant sanctions and engagements to copy after and imitate the same in their own behaviour. But conscience, enlightened and aroused by the light

which the law disclosed, was ever testifying of transgressions committed against the righteousness which it required. Instead of being a witness to which they could appeal for the proof of their having fulfilled the high ends for which they had been chosen and redeemed by God, it rather stood before him as their accuser, testifying against them of broken vows and violated obligations. And thus keeping perpetually alive upon the conscience a sense of guilt, it served to awaken in the hearts of those who really understood its spiritual meaning, a feeling of the need, and a longing expectation of the coming of Him who was to bring in the more perfect state of things, and take away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

The certainty of this effect both having been from the first designed, and also to some extent produced by the law, will always appear the more obvious, the more clearly we apprehend the connexion between the law and the ritual of worship, and see how inadequately the violations of the one seemed to have been met by the provisions of the other. We shall have occasion to refer to this more fully under the next division. But in some of the confessions of the Old Testament saints, we have undoubted indications of the feeling that the law, which they stood bound to obey, contained a reach of spiritual requirement which they were far from having complied with, and brought against them charges of guilt, from which they could obtain no satisfactory deliverance by any means of expiation then provided. The dread which God's manifested presence inspired, even in such seraphic bosoms as Isaiah's, "Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of Hosts," is itself a proof of this; for it betokened a conscience much more alive to impressions of guilt, than to the blessings of forgiveness and peace. It showed that the law of righteousness had written its convictions of sin too deeply on the tablet of their hearts, for the ceremonial institutions thoroughly to supplant them by the full sense of reconciliation. But a still more decided testimony to the same effect was given by the Psalmist, when in compositions designed for the public service of God, and of course expressing the sentiments of all sincere worshippers, he at once celebrated the law of God as every way excellent and precious, and at the same time spake of it as "exceeding broad,"—felt that it accused him of iniquities "more in number than the hairs of his head," so that if "the Lord were strict to mark them, none should be able to stand before him,"—nay, sometimes found himself in such a sense a sinner, that no sacrifice or offering could be accepted, and his soul was left without any ostensible means of atonement and cleansing, with nothing indeed to rest upon, but an unconditional forgiveness on God's part, and renewed surrender on its own.

It was the tendency of the law to beget such deep convictions of sin, and to leave upon the mind such a felt want of satisfaction, which secured with truly enlightened consciences such a favourable hearing for the doctrines of the gospel, and disposed them to rejoice in the consolation brought in by Christ. It was this which

gave in their minds such emphasis to the contrast: "The law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," and which led St. Paul to hold it out as an especial ground of comfort to believers in Christ, that "by him they should be justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses." It was this feature also of the law, which the same apostle had in his eye, when he described it as a "schoolmaster to lead men to Christ," shutting them up, by its stern requirements and wholesome discipline, to the faith which was afterwards to be revealed. And the contrast which he draws in the 3d chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, between the law and the gospel, proceeds entirely upon the same ground in reference to the law; that is, it is viewed simply as by itself, in the matter of its precepts, a revelation of the perfect righteousness of God, and, apart from the covenant of promise, with which it was connected, fitted only to inspire fear and trembling, to bring condemnation and death. He, therefore, calls it the ministration of condemnation, a letter that killeth, as in Rom. vii. 10, he testifies of having found it in his own experience to be unto death. The apostle does not mean to say, that this was properly the object for which the law was given—for then it had come directly to oppose and subvert the covenant of promise—but that it was an inseparable effect attending it,—arising from the perfection of its character as a rule of righteousness, compared with the manifold imperfections and sins ever discovering themselves among men. And hence it only required spiritual minds to enter thoroughly into the perception of the law's character, first to make them deeply sensible of their own guilt, and then to awaken in them the desire of something higher and better than was then provided as the true consolation of Israel.

An important connexion thus arises between the law and the gospel, and both are seen to hold respectively their proper places in the order of the divine dispensations. "It is true," as Tholuck has remarked with sound discrimination, "that the New Testament speaks more of grace than of sin; but did it not on this very account pre-suppose the existence of the Old Covenant with the law, and a God who is a holy and jealous God, that will not pass by trangression and sin? The Old covenant was framed for the conviction of sin, the New for the forgiveness of sin. The moral law, which God has written in indelible lines upon the heart of every man, was once also proclaimed with much solemnity from Sinai, that it might be clear that God, who appeared in fire and flame as the revealer of his holy law, is the same who has imprinted the image of holiness deep in the secret chambers of the bosom. Is not Israel, incessantly resisting with his stiff neck the God of love, until he has always again been reduced to subjection by the God of fiery indignation, an image of proud humanity in its constant warfare against God, who seeks to conquer them by anger and love?"* Hence, the order of God's dispensations is substantially

* From a work, Die Lehre von der Sünde und Versöhner, as quoted by Bialloblotzky, De Abrogatione Legis, p. 82, 83.

also the order of each man's experience. He must be humbled and bruised by the law, or, by the manifestation of God's righteousness, have his conscience somehow aroused to a sense of sin, before he can be brought heartily to acquiesce in the gospel plan of salvation by grace. Therefore, not only had the way of Christ to be prepared by one, who with a voice of terror preached anew the law's righteousness and threatenings, but Christ himself also needed to enter on the blessed work of the world's evangelization, by opening up the wide extent and deep spirituality of the law's requirements. For what is the Sermon on the Mount, but a republication of the law's righteousness, or a faithful exhibition of this, as opposed to the false and extenuating glosses under which it had been buried? And as Christ, during his personal ministry, could proceed but a small way in openly revealing the grace of the gospel, because still the work of the law was so imperfectly done in the hearts even of his own disciples, so, in the experience of men at large, it is because the sense and condemnation of sin are so seldom felt, that the benefits of salvation are so little known.*

3. The necessary connexion that subsisted between the law and the ceremonial institutions of the Old Testament, may be given as a still further reason of its revelation and enactment—although, when properly understood, this was not so much a distinct and separate end, as a combination of the two already specified. This law, perfect in its character, and perpetual in its obligation, formed the groundwork of all the symbolical services afterwards imposed; as was clearly indicated by the place chosen for its settled position. For, as the centre of all Judaism was the tabernacle, so the centre of this again was the law—the ark, which stood enshrined in the Most Holy Place, being made for the sole purpose of keeping the two tables of the covenant. So that the reflection could hardly fail to force itself on all but the most carnal and unthinking worshippers, that the observance of this law was the great end of the religion then established. Nor could any other use be imagined, of the strictly religious rites and institutions, which so manifestly pointed to this law, as their common ground and centre, than—either to assist as means in preserving alive the knowledge of its principles, and promoting their observance—or as remedies to provide against the evils naturally arising from its neglect and violation.

These two objects plainly harmonize with the reasons already

* The use of the law now described, though properly but its secondary design, is very commonly given by doctrinal writers of this country, as its chief, or almost only use to the Israelites. Thus, Bell on Cov. p. 142, speaking of God's design in giving the law from Sinai, says, "God gave it in subserviency to the promise, to show unto sinners their transgression and their guilt, and of consequence to drive them unto it." So another still more strongly: "God made it (viz. the covenant of law, which is regarded by the author as the same with the covenant of works,) with the Israelites for no other end, than that man being thereby convinced of his weakness, he might flee to Christ." (Marrow of Modern Div. P. i. c. 2.) Their putting this design first, and making it in a manner all, arose from their viewing the religion of the Old Covenant too exclusively in a typical aspect, as if the things belonging to it had not also had an immediate and direct bearing.

assigned for the giving of the law, and present the ceremonial services and institutions to our view, as partly subservient to the righteousness it enjoined, and partly conducive to its ulterior end of leading souls to Christ. It will be our endeavour in the Third Part to bring fully out, and illustrate this relation between the law of the two tables, and the symbols of Judaism. And at present we must content ourselves with briefly indicating its general nature.

(1.) In so far as those symbols had in view the first of the objects just mentioned, they are to be regarded much in the same light as the means and ordinances of grace, under the New Testament. It is through these that the knowledge of the gospel is diffused, its divine principles implanted in the hearts of men, and a suitable channel also provided for expressing the thoughts and feelings which the reception of the gospel tends to awaken. Such precisely was one great design of the symbolical institutions. They were by no means of arbitrary appointment, as if the simple command of God were the only reason that could be assigned for the actions and services belonging to them, or as if the outward and bodily part of these were required on its own account. The reason of their appointment was their fitness to implant, nourish, or express the great principles of religious truth and obligation; and they were as certainly instituted with this design, as the symbolical institutions of the New Testament—baptism and the Lord's Supper. No more in the one case, than in the other, was the *opus operatum*, the mere bodily service, what was properly contemplated, but that only as the shell and emblem of something higher. The outward came into existence, merely for the sake of the religious and moral elements embodied in it, the spiritual lessons it conveyed, or the sentiments of godly fear and brotherly love which it served to awaken. In a word, fleshly ordinances were made, to a great extent, the channels of conveying spiritual instruction, and for bringing perpetually into remembrance the grand distinctions of the law respecting good and evil. It was the more necessary that this should be done, and spread out into a vast multiplicity of forms, as the dispensation then set up admitted so very sparingly of direct instruction, and was comparatively stinted even in its supplies of inward grace; so that it was mainly through those symbolical transactions that the knowledge of the divine will was to be acquired, and its demands kept fresh upon the conscience. Hence, it was necessary that they should be carried beyond the strictly religious territory, and should pervade all the relations of life. The Israelite, in the commonest circumstances rising up around him, in the very food he ate, must have something to remind him of the law of his God, and feel himself enclosed on every side with the signs and indications of that righteousness, which it was his great duty as a member of the covenant to cherish and exemplify.

Since the ceremonial law, as a teaching and disciplinary institute, thus coincided with the moral, and only in another form reechoed its meaning, and confirmed its testimony, it is plain, that God never could be satisfied with a mere outward conformity to the

letter of the Mosaic ritual. Nor, though support has often been sought in Scripture itself for this shallow notion, especially in regard to the sacrifices, does the least foundation exist for it there. Hengstenberg justly remarks, that "there cannot be produced out of the whole Old Testament one single passage, in which the notion, that sacrifices of themselves, and apart from the state of mind in the offerers, are well-pleasing to God, is noticed, except for the purpose of vigorously opposing it. When, for example, in Lev. xxvi. 31, it is said, in reference to the ungodly, 'I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours,' and when in Gen. iv. 4, 5, we find that along with an outward similarity, the offerings of Cain and Abel met with such a different reception from God, and that this difference is represented as being based on something *personal* to the individuals, it is all but expressly asserted, that sacrifices were regarded only as expressive of the mind within."* And again: "That the law, with all its appearance of outwardness, still possessed throughout a religious-moral, an internal, spiritual character, is manifest from this, that the two internal commands of love to God, and one's neighbour, are in the law itself represented as those, in which all the rest lie enclosed, the fulfilment of which carried along with it the fulfilment of all individual precepts, and without which no obedience was practicable: 'And now, Israel, what does the Lord thy God require of thee,' &c. Deut. x. 12, vi. 5, xi. 1, 13, xiii. 3, xxx. 15, 20; Lev. xix. 18. If every thing in the law is made to turn upon love, it is self-evident, that a dead bodily service could not be what was properly required. Besides, in Lev. xxvi. 41, the violation of the law is represented as the necessary product of 'an uncircumcised heart,' and in Deut. x. 16, we find the remarkable words: 'And ye shall circumcise the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked,'—which condemn all Pharisaism, that is ever expecting good fruit from bad trees, and would gather grapes from thorns, and figs from thistles."†—What is called the ceremonial law, therefore, was just in its immediate and primary aspect, an exhibition by means of symbolical rites and institutions of the righteousness enjoined in the decalogue.‡

(2.) But the more fully the ceremonial parts of the Mosaic legislation were fitted to accomplish this end, they must so much the more have tended to help forward the other end of the law; viz. to produce conviction of sin and prepare the heart for Christ. "By the law is the knowledge of sin,"—the sense of shortcomings and transgressions is in exact proportion to the insight that has been obtained into its true spiritual meaning. And the manifold restrictions and services of a bodily kind, which were imposed upon the Israelites, as they all spoke of holiness and sin, so where their voice was honestly listened to, it must have been with the effect of

* Introduc. to Ps. xxxii.

† Authentie, ii. p. 611, 612.

‡ For some good remarks on this subject, see Graves on Pent. P. ii. Lect. 2, conclusion. Some additional explanations will naturally fall to be made regarding it, when we come to treat of the ratification of the covenant by sacrifice.

begetting impressions of guilt. They were perpetually uttering without the sanctuary the cry of transgression, which was rising within, under the throne of God, from the two tables of testimony. They might be said to do more. For of them especially does it hold, "They entered that the offence might abound," since, while calling upon men to abstain from sin, they at the same time multiplied the occasions of offence. The strict limitations and numerous requirements of service, through which they did the one, rendered it unavoidable that they should also do the other; as they thus necessarily made many things to be sin, which were not so before, or in their own nature, and consequently increased both the number of transgressions, and their burden upon the conscience. How comparatively difficult must it have been to apprehend through so many occasions and witnesses of guilt the light of God's reconciliation and love! How often must the truly spiritual heart have felt as heavy-laden with its yoke, and scarcely able to bear it! And how glad should have been to all the members of the covenant the tidings of that "liberty with which Christ makes his people free!"

This, however, was not the whole. Had the ceremonial institutions and services simply co-operated with the decalogue, in producing upon men's minds a conviction of guilt, and shutting them up to the necessity of salvation, the yoke of bondage would indeed have been intolerable, and despair rather than the hope of salvation must have been the consequence. They so far differed, however, from the precepts of the law, that they presented a kind of satisfaction for the sin which the law condemned—met the conscious defect of righteousness, which the law produced, with vicarious sacrifices and bodily lustrations. But these, as formerly noticed, were so manifestly inadequate to the end in view, that though they might, from being God's own appointed remedies, restore the troubled conscience to a state of peace, they could not thoroughly satisfy it. First of all, they betrayed their own insufficiency, by allowing certain fearful gaps in the list of transgressions to stand unprovided for. Besides, the comparatively small distinction that was made, as regards purification, between mere bodily defilements and moral pollution, and the absolute necessity of resorting anew to the blood of atonement, as often as the sense of guilt again returned, were plain indications that such services "could not make the comers thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience." To the thoughtful mind it must have seemed as if a struggle was continually proceeding between God's holiness and the sin of his creatures, in which the former found only a most imperfect vindication. For what just comparison could be made between the forfeited life of an accountable being and the blood of an irrational victim? Or between the defilements of a polluted conscience and the external washings of the outward man? Surely the enlightened conscience must have felt the need of something greatly more valuable to compensate for the evil done by sin, and must have seen in the existing means of purification only the temporary sub-

stitutes of better things to come. Such, at least, was the ultimate design of God; and whatever may have been the extent or clearness of view in those who lived among the shadows of the law, regarding the coming realities of the gospel, it is impossible that they should have entered into the spirit of the former dispensation, without being prepared to hail a suffering Messiah as the only true consolation of Israel; and prepared also to join in the song of the redeemed, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."

At the same time, there can be no doubt, that here peculiarly lay the danger of the members of the Old Covenant—a danger, which the issue too clearly proved, that but a small proportion of them were able properly to escape. Not seeing to the end of the things amid which they were placed, and wanting the incalculable advantage of the awful revelation of God's righteousness in Christ, the law failed to teach them effectually of the nature of that righteousness, or to convince them of sin, or to prepare them for the reception of the Saviour. But failing in these grand points, the law became a stumbling-block and a hinderance in their path. For now men's consciences adjusted themselves to the imperfect appearances of things, and acted much in the spirit of those in present times, who, as a sensible and pious writer expresses it, "try to bring up the power of free-will to holiness, by bringing holiness down to the power of free-will."* The dead letter, consequently, became every thing with them; they saw nothing beneath the outward shell, nor felt any need for other and higher realities than those with which they had immediately to do. Self-righteousness was the inevitable result; and *that* rooting itself the more deeply, and towering the more proudly aloft with its pretensions, that it had to travel the round of such a vast multiplicity of laws and ordinances. For great as the demand was, which the observance of these made upon the obedience, still, as viewed by the carnal eye, it was something that could be measured and done—not so broad but that the mind could grasp it—and hence, instead of undermining the pride of nature, only supplying it with a greater mass of materials for erecting its claims on the favour of Heaven. This self-righteousness was the prevailing tendency of evil under the Old Dispensation, as an unconcern about personal righteousness is that of the New. How many were snared by it! And how fatally! For of all "the spirits in prison," to whom the word of the gospel came with its offers of deliverance, those proved to be the most hopelessly incarcerated in their strongholds of error, who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and stumbled at the rock of a free salvation.

* Fraser on Sanctification, p. 298.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RELATION OF BELIEVERS UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT TO THE LAW—IN WHAT SENSE THEY ARE FREE FROM IT—AND WHY IT IS NO LONGER PROPER TO KEEP THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS CONNECTED WITH IT.

THE relation of believers under the New Testament to the law has been a fruitful subject of controversy among divines. This has arisen chiefly from the apparently contradictory statements made respecting it in New Testament Scripture; and this again, partly from the change introduced by the setting up of the more spiritual machinery of the gospel dispensation, and partly also in consequence of the mistaken views entertained regarding the law, by those to whom the gospel first came, which required to be corrected by strong representations of an opposite description. Thus, on the one hand, we find our Lord saying, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."* Stronger language could not possibly be employed to assert the abiding force and obligation of the law's requirements under the New Testament dispensation; for that this is specially meant by "the kingdom of heaven," is too obvious to require any proof. In perfect conformity with this statement of our Lord we find the apostles every where enforcing the duties enjoined in the law; as when the apostle James describes the genuine Christian by "his looking into the perfect law of liberty, and continuing therein," and exhorts the disciples "not to speak evil of the law, or to judge it, but to fulfil it;"† or when the apostle Paul not only speaks of himself as "being under the law to Christ,"‡ but presses on the disciples at Rome and Galatia the constant exercise of love on the ground of its being "the fulfilling of the law,"§ and in answer to the question, "Do we, then, make void the law through faith?" he replies, "God forbid; yea, we establish the law."‖

But, on the other hand, when we turn to a different class of passages, we meet with statements that seem to run in the precisely opposite direction, especially in the writings of St. Paul; there alone, indeed, in the form of dogmatical assertions, although in a practical form, the same element of thought occurs in the other epistles. In the first epistle to Timothy, he lays this down as a

* Matth. v. 17—19. † Jas. i. 25, ii. 8–12. ‡ 1 Cor. ix. 21.
§ Rom. xiii. 10; Gal. v. 14. ‖ Rom. iii. 21.

certain position, that "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient."* And in the epistle to the Romans, he indicates a certain contrast between the state of believers now in this respect, with what it was under the former dispensation, and asserts that the law does not stand in the relation it once did. "Now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held, that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter."† And again, "Sin shall not have dominion over you, for you are not under the law, but under grace."‡

That in all these passages the law, in the strict and proper sense, is meant—the law of the ten commandments, the sum of whose precepts is perfect love to God and man, we may here take for granted, after what has been said regarding it in the first chapter of this Part. It seems perfectly unaccountable, on any grounds of criticism at least, that so many English writers should have thought of solving the difficulty arising from the use of such language, by alleging the apostle to have had in view simply the ceremonial law, as contra-distinguished from the moral. This view, we should imagine, is now nearly exploded among the better informed students of Scripture; for not only does the apostle, as Archbishop Whately states, speak of the freedom of Christians from the law, "without limiting or qualifying the assertion—without even hinting at any distinction between moral and ceremonial or civil precepts," but there can be no doubt, that it is what is commonly understood by the moral part of the Mosaic legislation—the decalogue, that he has specially and properly in view.§

In what respect, then, can it be said of Christians, that they are freed from this law, or are not under it? We must first answer the question in a general way; after which only can we be prepared for pointing out distinctly, wherein the relation of the members of the New Covenant to the law differs from that of those who lived under the Old.

1. Believers in Christ are not under the law as to the ground of their condemnation or justification before God. It is not the law, but Christ, that they are indebted to for pardon and life, and receiving these from him as his gift of grace, they cannot be brought

* Ch. i. 9. † Rom. vii. 6. ‡ Rom. vi. 14.

§ The work of Fraser on Sanctification, which is less known at least in England than it should be, is perfectly conclusive against Locke, Hammond, Whitby and others, that the apostle in Romans had specially in view the moral and not the ceremonial law. It is impossible, indeed, that such a notion could ever have been entertained by such men, but for strong doctrinal prejudices. The error of Archbishop Whately, brought out in his essay on the Abolition of the Law, is not so palpable as the one here adverted to, but it is the one generally made by expositors, especially those of the Rationalist School on the Continent (see Biallobolt. De Abrog. Legis, p. 57, &c., and the authorities there referred to,) viz. that the apostle includes the ceremonial along with the moral, and treats of them indiscriminately. We have already endeavoured to prove the opposite of this; and we believe it is impossible to attain to clear and satisfactory views on the whole subject without first abandoning this error, and regarding the argument of the apostle as referring, according to the obvious tenor and import of his language, to the law, whose precepts are all "holy and just and good," and that perpetually.

by the law into condemnation and death. The reason is, that Christ has by his own pure and spotless obedience done what the law, in the hands of fallen humanity, could not do—he has brought in the everlasting righteousness, which by its infinite worth has merited eternal life for as many as believe upon him. "There is *therefore* now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus;" "Whosoever believeth upon him is justified from all things;" or, in the still stronger and more comprehensive language of Christ himself, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but hath passed from death to life."*

This, it will be perceived, is what is commonly understood by deliverance from the law as a covenant. But it is proper to remark, that though the idea expressed in such language is scriptural, the language itself is not so, and is rather fitted to mislead. For it appears to imply that as the law was certainly formed into a covenant with the Old Testament Church, its being so formed made it something else than a rule of life, and warranted the Israelites to look to it, in the first instance at least, for life and blessing. This we have already shown was not the purpose for which the law was either given or converted into a covenant among them; and deliverance from it, in the sense mentioned above, marks no essential distinction between the case of believers under the Old and that of those under the New Testament dispensation. The standing of the one, as well as the other, was in grace; and when the law came, it came not for the purpose of subverting or changing that, but only to direct and bind them to carry out the important ends for which they had been partakers of grace and blessing. Strictly speaking, therefore, the church never was under the law as a covenant, in the sense commonly understood by divines; it was only the mistake of the carnal portion of her members to suppose themselves to have been so. But as God himself is unchangeable in holiness, the demands of his law, as revealed to men in grace, must be substantially the same with those which they are bound in nature to comply with under pain of his everlasting displeasure. In this respect all may be said, by the very constitution of their being, to be naturally under law to God, and as transgressors of law liable to punishment. But through the grace of God in Christ we are not so under it, if we have become true believers in him. We have pardon and acceptance through faith in his blood; and even though "in many things offending and in all coming short," yet while faith abides in us we cannot come into condemnation. To this belong all such passages as treat of justification, and represent it as being granted without the law, or the deeds of the law, to the ungodly, of free grace in Christ, &c.

2. But this is not the *only* respect in which the apostle declares believers now to be free from the law, nor the respect at all which he has in view in the sixth and seventh chapters of his epistle to

* Rom. viii. 1; Acts xiii. 39; John v. 14.

the Romans. For the subject he is there handling is not justification, but sanctification. The question he is discussing, is not how, as condemned and sinful creatures, we may be accepted as righteous before God; but how, being already pardoned and accepted in the Beloved, we ought to live? In this respect also he affirms that we are dead to the law, and are not under it, but under grace—the grace, that is, of God's indwelling Spirit, whose quickening impulse and sweet constraint takes the place of the law's outward prescriptions and magisterial authority. And if it were not already clear, from the order of the apostle's thoughts, and the stage at which he has arrived in the discussion, that it is in this point of view he is now considering the law, the purpose for which he asserts our freedom to have been obtained, would put it beyond all reasonable doubt; viz. "that sin might not have dominion over us," (ch. vi. 14,) or, "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us," (ch. viii. 4.*)

According to the doctrine of the apostle, then, believers are not under the law as to their walk and conduct; or, as he says elsewhere, "the law is not for the righteous;" believers "have the Spirit of the Lord, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." But is not this dangerous doctrine? For where now is the safeguard against sin? May not each one do as he lists, practically forgetting the distinction between holiness and sin, or even denying its existence, with the thorough Antinomians, as regards the children of God, on the ground that where no law is, there is no transgression? To such questions the apostle's reply is, "God forbid,"—so far from it, that the freedom he asserts from the law has for its sole aim a deliverance from sin's dominion, and a fruitfulness in all well-doing to God.

The truth more fully stated is simply this: When the believer receives Christ as the Lord his righteousness, he is not only justified by grace, but he comes into a state of grace, or gets grace into his heart as a living, reigning, governing principle of life. But what is this grace but the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus? And this Spirit is emphatically the Holy Spirit: holiness is the very element of his being, and the essential law of his working; every desire he breathes, every feeling he awakens, every action he disposes and enables us to perform, is according to godliness. And if only we are sufficiently possessed of this Spirit, and yield ourselves to his direction and control, we no longer need the restraint and discipline of the law; we are free from it, because superior to

* It seems very strange, considering how plain and explicit the apostle's meaning is, that Professor Lee of Cambridge should still say: "The main question, I think, here discussed (viz. in ch. vii.) by the apostle is, how is a man to be justified with God!" (Dissertations, 1, sec. 10.) Haldane, also, in his commentary, maintains the same obviously untenable view, as we cannot but term it. Fraser (Sanctification, on Rom. vii. 4,) justly remarks, that though the similitude of marriage used by the apostle in ch. vii., "*might* be explained to show that the sinner cannot attain justification or any of its comfortable consequences by the law," yet that it is "another consequence of the marriage covenant and relation that he hath in his eye," viz. "the bringing forth of fruit unto God;" in other words, the maintaining of such holy lives as constitute our sanctification.

it; quickened and led by the Spirit, we of ourselves love and do the things which the law requires.

Does not nature itself teach substantially the same lesson in *its* line of things? The child, so long as he *is* a child, must be subject to the law of his parents; his safety and well-being depend on his being so; he must be hemmed in on every side, checked and stimulated by that law of his parents, otherwise mischief and destruction will infallibly overtake him. But as he ripens toward manhood, he becomes freed from this law, because he no longer needs such discipline and restraint; he is a law to himself, putting away childish things, and of his own accord acting as the parental authority, had he still been subject to it, would have required and enforced him to do. In a word, the *mind* has become his, from which the parental law proceeded, and he has consequently become independent of its outward prescriptions. And what is it to be under the grace of God's Spirit, but to have *the mind of God?*—the mind of Him who gave the law simply as a revelation of what was in his heart respecting the holiness of his people; so that the more they have of the one, the less, obviously, they need of the other; and only require to be complete in the grace of the Spirit, to be rendered wholly independent of the bonds and restrictions of the law.

Or, think again of the relation in which a good man stands with respect to the laws of his country. In one sense, indeed, he is under them; but, in another and higher sense, he is not—he is above them, and moves along his course freely and without restraint, as if they existed not. For what is their design and object? To prevent under severe penalties the commission of crime. But crime is already the object of his abhorrence; he needs no penalties to keep him from it; he would never touch or injure the property of a neighbour, though there were not a single enactment in the statute-book on the subject; his own love of good and hatred of evil keep him in the path of rectitude, not the fines, imprisonments, or tortures, which the law hangs over the head of the criminal. The law was not made for *him.*

So is it precisely with the man who is under grace. The law, considered as an outward thing, standing over him with so many commands and prohibitions, is in a manner gone for him, for it is now within his heart; it is the law of the Spirit of life in his inner man; emphatically, therefore, "the law of liberty;" his delight is to do it, and it were better for him not to live, than to live otherwise than the tenor of the law requires. We see in Jesus, the holy child of God, the perfect exemplar of this free-will service to heaven. For while he came to fulfil the law, being replenished with the Spirit above measure, he fulfilled it as if he fulfilled it not; it was his very meat to do the will of Him that sent him; and not more certainly did the law enjoin, than he in his inmost soul loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Such also in a measure will ever be the case with the devout believer upon Jesus—in the same measure in which he has received of his Master's spirit. Does the law

command him to bear no false witness against his neighbour? He is already so renewed in the spirit of his mind, as to speak the truth in his heart, and be ready to swear to his own hurt. Does the law demand, through all its precepts, supreme love to God, and brotherly love to men? Why should it need to do so of him who has the Eternal Spirit of love bearing sway within, and therefore may be said to live and breathe in an atmosphere of love? Like Paul, he can say, with king-like freedom, "I can do all things through Christ strengthening me;" even in chains I am free; I choose what God chooses for me; his will in doing or suffering I embrace as my own; for I have him working in me both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

Now, it is here that the difference properly comes in between the Old and the New Testament dispensations—a difference, however, it must be carefully marked, of degree only, and not of kind. In correspondence with the change that has taken place in the character of the divine administration, the relative position of believers has changed to the law and the Spirit; but under both covenants alike, an indispensable place belongs to each of them, and though differently given, yet still both given, and for the same ends and purposes. In the former dispensation the law stood more prominently out, and was the grand ostensible means for leading men to holiness—supplying, as by a sort of artificial stimulant and support, the still necessary defect in the inward gift of the Spirit's grace. We say the *necessary* defect; for the proper materials of the Spirit's working, the great objects of faith and hope, not yet being provided or openly revealed, the Spirit could not be fully given, nor could his work be carried on otherwise than in a mystery. It was so carried on, however; every true member of the covenant was a partaker of the Spirit, because he had his standing in grace, only his relation to the Spirit was of a more hidden and secret, to the law, of a more ostensible and manifest character. In the New Testament dispensation this relation is precisely reversed, although in each respect it still exists. The work of Christ, which furnishes the proper materials of the Spirit's operations, having been accomplished, and himself glorified, the Spirit is now fully and unreservedly given; it is through his grace accompanying the word of the gospel, that the divine kingdom avowedly purposes to effect its spiritual designs, and bring forth its fruits of righteousness to God. This, therefore, it is to which the believer now stands immediately and ostensibly related, as the agency through which he is to fulfil the high ends of his calling—while the law retires into the back-ground, or should be known only as existing within, impressed in all its essential lines of truth and duty upon the tablet of the heart, and manifesting itself in the deeds of a righteous life. Whether the law or the spirit stand more prominently forward, the end is the same—righteousness. The only difference that exists, is as to the means of securing this end—more outward in the one case, more inward in the other; yet in each a measure of both required, and one and the same point aimed at. Hence the word of

the apostle: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," that is, both alike are for righteousness—that is the one great end which Christ and the law have equally in view; but in Christ it is secured in a far higher way than it could possibly be through the law, since he has not only perfected himself as the divine head and surety of his people in the righteousness which the law requires, but also endows them with the plentiful grace of his Spirit, "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in them, walking not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

With these distinctions clearly perceived, we shall easily understand what is said in the New Testament scriptures of the difference, in a practical point of view, as to the condition of believers under the past and the present dispensations respectively. This is spoken of as a state of comparative freedom, that of a certain species of restraint or bondage—not the bondage, indeed, of slaves and mercenaries, which belonged only to the carnal, as opposed to the believing portion of the church—but the bondage of those, who, though free-born children, are still in nonage, and must be kept under the restraint and discipline of an external law. This, however, could in no case be the whole of the agency with which the believer was plied, for then his yoke must have been literally the galling bondage of the slave. He *must* have had more or less the Spirit of life within, begetting and prompting him to do the things which the law outwardly enjoined—making the pulse of life in the heart beat in harmony with the rule of life prescribed in the law; so that, while he still felt as under tutors and governors, it was not as one needing to be "held in with bit and bridle," but rather as one disposed readily and cheerfully to keep to the appointed course. This would be the case with him always the more, the more diligently he employed the measure of grace placed within his reach; and if in a spirit of faith he could indeed "lift the latch and force his way" onwards to the end of those things which were then established, he might even have become insensible to the bonds and trammels of his childhood-condition, and be conscious of the free and manly spirit of a ripened saint. So it unquestionably was with the Psalmist, and doubtless might have been with all, if they had but used, as he did, the privileges of grace. For such, the law was not a mere outward yoke, nor properly a yoke at all; it was "within their heart;" they delighted in its precepts, and meditated therein day and night; to listen to its instructions was sweeter to them than honey, and to obey its dictates was better than thousands of gold and silver.*

It is only, therefore, in a comparative sense, that we are to understand the passages in the New Testament Scripture referred to; and of course in the same sense, that similar passages are to be interpreted in Old Testament Scripture. Such, for example, as Jer. xxxi. 31—34: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the

* See especially Ps. i., xv., xxiv., xl., cxix.

house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, . . . but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people; and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour," &c. (comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27, which differs only in particularizing the agency, by which the better state of things was to be introduced—the larger gift of the Spirit.) "The discourse here cannot be of a new and more complete revelation of the law of God, for this is common to both economies; no jot or tittle of it can be lost under the New Testament, nor can a jot or tittle be added to it; God's law rests on his nature, and this is eternally immutable, (Mal. iii. 6.) Just as little can the discourse be of the introduction of an entirely new relation, which by no means has the former for its groundwork." In this respect, Kimchi rightly remarks: "Non erit fœderis novitas, sed stabilimentum ejus" (not a change but an establishing of the covenant.) The covenant with Israel is eternal; Jehovah would not be Jehovah, if an absolutely new beginning could take place. (Rom. xv. 8.) When, therefore, the subject of discourse is here the antithesis of an old and a new covenant, the former must designate, not the relation of God to Israel in itself, and in all its extent, but rather only the former manifestation of this relation—that, through which the Lord, until the time of the prophet, had made himself known as the God of Israel."* And in regard to the difference indicated by the prophet as to the believer's connexion with the law under the two covenants, the learned author expressing his concurrence in particular with Calvin and Buddeus, goes on to show, that this also is not absolute, but only relative. He justly states, that the idea of a purely outward giving of the law is inconceivable, as God would then have done for Israel nothing farther than he did for the betrayer Judas, in whose conscience he proclaimed his holy law, without giving him any power to repent—that the terms in which the law is spoken of by the Psalmist, in the name of the Old Testament saints, shows it to have been in their experience no longer a law, that worketh wrath, but a law in connexion with the Spirit whose commands are not grievous—and that the antithesis between the Old and the New state of things, though in itself but relative, was expressed in the absolute form, merely because the gift of the Old Testament appeared, when compared with the infinitely more important and richer blessing of the New, as so small, that it vanished out of sight.

But something else than that should also vanish from *our* sight. For if we enter into these views, not more accordant with the testimony of Scripture, than based in the nature of things, the idea of the law's abrogation or abolition under the New Testament, in whatever form proposed, will be repudiated as equally

* Hengstenberg's Christology on Jer. xxxi. 31.

dangerous and ungrounded. The law is in no proper sense abolished by the revelations of the gospel; nor does the apostle in any fair construction of his language say that it is. He merely says, that through grace we are not under it, and in a conjugal respect are dead to it. In a certain qualified sense, believers in Old Testament times might be said to be married to it, or to be under it—only, however, in a qualified sense, for God himself—the God of grace, as well as of law—was properly their husband (Jer. xxxi. 32,) and they stood under the covenant of grace before they came under the covenant of law. But though even in that qualified sense believers are not now under the law or married to it, the righteousness required is as much binding upon their consciences, and expected at their hands, as it ever was at any former period of the church's history. More so, indeed; for the very reason, as the apostle tells us, why they are placed less directly under the law, and more under the Spirit, is, that the end of the law might be more certainly attained, that a richer harvest might be yielded of its righteousness. Therefore, it is, that in the same epistle in which those expressions are used, conformity to the law's requirements is still held out, and inculcated as the very perfection of Christian excellence (Rom. xiii. 8—10.) For it is not, as if these two, the law and the Spirit, were contending authorities, or forces drawing in two distinct and separate lines. No, they are essentially and thoroughly agreed—emanations both of them of the unchanging holiness of Godhead—the one the outward form and expression of this, the other its inward spring and throbbing pulse of life. What the one teaches, the other wills—what the one requires, the other enables to perform;—and precisely as the law at first came as a handmaid to the previously existing covenant of grace, so does it still remain in the hand of the Spirit to aid him, amid the workings of the flesh, and the imperfections of grace, in carrying out the objects for which he condescends to dwell and act in the bosoms of men.*

* Hence the monstrous absurdity and error of Antinomianism, which proceeds on the supposition of the law and the Spirit being two distinct, possibly contending authorities—a doctrine not so much opposed to any particular portion of Scripture, as the common antithesis of all its revelations, and the subversion of all its principles. But let it once be understood, that the law and the Spirit have but one end in view, and one path, in a sense, to reach it—that the motions of the Spirit within, invariably, and by the highest of all necessities, take the direction prescribed by the law without—let this be understood, and Antinomianism wants even the shadow of a ground to stand upon.—It is not merely the Antinomians, however, who contend for the abrogation of the law; the same thing is substantially done by certain divines, who seem to regard themselves as the peculiar guardians of divine truth against Antinomianism. For example, Archbishop Whately, in the Essay before referred to, on the Abolition of the Law, maintains this position: "The simplest and clearest way then of stating the case, is to lay down, on the one hand, that the Mosaic law was limited both to the nation of the Israelites, and to the period before the gospel; but, on the other hand, that the natural principles of morality, which, among other things, it inculcates, are from their own character of universal obligation, and that Christians are bound to obey the moral commandments it contained, not *because* they are commandments of the Mosaic law, but because they *are* moral." This view, which puts the decalogue on a footing with the laws of Solon or Mahomet, in so far as any obligation on the conscience is concerned, is that also maintained, and with a considerable show of learning, supported by Bialloblotzky, in his work De Abrog. Legis, the sub-

Here the question comes in, Of what use is the law to those who really are under the Spirit? It would be of none, if the work of spiritual renovation, which his grace is given to effect, were perfected in us. But since this is far from being the case, since imperfection still cleaves to the child of God, and the flesh, in a greater or less degree, still wars against the Spirit, the outward discipline of the law can never be safely dispensed with. Even St. Paul was obliged to confess that he found the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and that though he was ever following after, he was conscious of not having yet attained to the full measure of grace and excellence in Christ. Therefore, for his own quickening and direction, as well as for that of others, he felt it needful to press the demands of law, and to look to the exceeding breadth of its requirements. Luther also, and his fellow-labourers, although their views were not always correct as to the relation in which Israel stood to the law, nor by any means clear regarding the precise nature of the change introduced by the gospel, yet were sound enough on this point. As appears even by the quotations produced by Bialloblotzky from their symbolical books; for example: "Although the law was not made for the righteous (as the apostle testifies, 1 Tim. i. 9,) yet this is not to be understood, as if the righteous might live without law. For the divine law is written upon their hearts. The true and genuine meaning, therefore, of Paul's words is, that the law cannot bring those who have been reconciled to God through Christ under its curse, and that

stance of which, though with the suppression of some of the more obnoxious statements, we regret to see, has been served up in the Biblical Cyclopædia for students in this country. The form into which the learned author throws his statement is, that the nomothetical authority of the Mosaic law is abolished, but its didactical authority remains; in other words, it has no binding force as a law upon the conscience, but may still be profitably used for direction in the way of duty, due allowance, of course, being made for all that belonged to it of temporary appointment and ceremonial observance, which is no longer even a matter of duty. His chief arguments in supporting this view, are, that in some things, especially in regard to the Sabbath, marriage, the symbolical rites (for all are thrown, as we observed before, into one heap,) Christ and his apostles have corrected the law—and that they oppose the authority of the Spirit to the external tyranny of the law (as if these were two contending masters, and we actually have the passage, "No man can serve two masters," produced in proof of the argument, p. 63.) We have already met these arguments, and need not enter into any new examination of them. But we may simply remark, that such views necessarily open the widest door for Antinomianism and Rationalism; for if, as possessors of the Spirit, we must first judge what part of the law is moral or didactic, and even when we have ascertained this, still are permitted to hold that we are not connected with it as a matter of binding and authoritative obligation, it is easy to see what slight convictions of sin will be felt, what loose notions of duty entertained, how feeble a barrier left against either the carnal or the fanatical spirit ridding itself of the plainest obligations.—Many unguarded statements, easily susceptible of an improper meaning, and partly, indeed, expressing such, are to be found in Luther's works on the law, some of which are quoted by Bialloblotzky. But his real views, when carefully and doctrinally, not controversially expressed, were substantially correct, as may be seen in the quotation given from the Lutheran symbolical books in the text—or from Melancthon's works, which Luther is well known to have held to be better expositions than his own of their doctrinal views. For example, after speaking (vol. i. p. 309) of the Mosaic law as not availing to justification, and in its civil and ceremonial parts done away, Melancthon adds: "But the moral law, since it is the wisdom of God and his eternal rule of righteousness, and has been revealed, that man should be like God, cannot be abolished, but remains perpetually, Rom. iii. 31, viii. 4."

its restraint cannot be irksome to the renewed, since they delight in the law of God after the inner man....But believers are not completely and perfectly renewed in this life. And though their sins are covered by the absolutely perfect obedience of Christ, so as not to be imputed to believers to their condemnation—and though the mortification of the old Adam, and the renovation in the spirit of their mind has been begun by the Holy Spirit, yet the old Adam still remains in nature's powers and affections," &c.*

There are three different respects in which we still need the law of God, and which it will be enough briefly to indicate: 1. To keep us under grace, as the source of all our security and blessing. This we are ever apt through the pride and self-confidence of the flesh to forget, even though we have already in some measure known it. Therefore the law must be our schoolmaster, not only to bring us to Christ at the beginning of a Christian life, but also afterwards to keep us there, and force continually back upon us the conviction, that we must be in all respects the debtors of grace. For when we see what a reach of holiness is in the law of God, how it extends to the thoughts and affections of the heart, as well as to our words and actions, and demands, in regard to all, the exercise of an unswerving devoted love, then we are made to feel that the law, if trusted in as a ground of confidence, must still work wrath, and that, convinced by it as transgressors, we must betake for all peace and consolation to the grace of Christ. Here alone, in his atonement, can we find satisfaction to our consciences, and here alone also in the strengthening aid of his Spirit, the ability to do the things which the law requires. 2. The law, again, is needed to restrain and hold us back from those sins which we might otherwise be inclined to commit. It is true, that in one who is really a subject of grace, there can be no habitual inclination to live in sin; for he is God's workmanship in Christ Jesus, created in him unto good works. But the temptations of the world, and the devices of the spiritual adversary may often be too much for any measure of grace he has already received successfully to resist; he may want in certain circumstances the willing and faithful mind either to withstand evil or to prosecute, as he should, the path of righteousness; and, therefore, the law is still placed before him by the Spirit with its stern prohibitions and awful threatenings to move with fear, where love fails to prompt and influence the heart. Thus the apostle: "I determined to know nothing among you but Christ and him crucified"—it is my delight, my very life, to preach the doctrines of his salvation—but if the flesh should recoil from the work and render the spirit unwilling, "a dispensation is committed to me, yea wo is unto me if I preach not the gospel." Thus the discipline of the law comes in to supply the imperfections of the spirit, and check the still remaining tendencies of sin. 3. And it is yet farther needed to present continually before the eye of the mind a clear repre-

* De Abrog. Legis, p. 72, 73.

sentation of the righteousness which, through the grace of the Spirit, believers should be ever striving to attain. While that grace is still imperfect, they are necessarily in danger of entertaining low and defective views of duty; nay, in times of peculiar temptation or undue excitement, they might even mistake the motions of the flesh for the promptings of the Spirit, and turn aside into the path of error. But the law stands before them with its revelation of righteousness, as a faithful and resplendent mirror, in which they may behold, without any danger of delusion or mistake, the perfect image of that excellence which they should be ever yielding to God. "We are free—we have the Spirit, and are not subject to bondage." True, but free only to act as servants of Christ, and not throw around you a cloak of maliciousness. You are free, not to introduce what you please into the service of God, for he is a jealous God, and will not allow his glory to be associated with the vain imaginations of men; you are free to worship him only in spirit and in truth. You are free—what! to give or withhold, as seems good to you, what may be needed to advance the cause of God in the world—to employ or not for sacred purposes the weekly return of his day of rest! How impossible! seeing, that if you are really filled with the Spirit, the love of God must have been breathed into your soul, so as of necessity to make it your delight to do what you can for his glory, and to engage in the services which bring you into nearest fellowship with Heaven.—Thus, the freedom of the Spirit is a freedom only within the bounds and limits of the law; and the law itself must stand, lest the flesh, taking advantage of the weakness of the Spirit's grace, should in its wantonness break out into courses which are displeasing to the mind of God.

So much for the law in the strict and proper sense—the law of the ten commandments, the freedom from which enjoyed by the Christian is not absolute, but relative only; just as the Israelites' want of the Spirit was also relative, and not absolute. But in regard to what is called the ceremonial law, the freedom *is* absolute, and to keep up the observance of its symbolical institutions and services after the new dispensation entered, was not only to retain a yoke that might be dispensed with, but also an incongruity to be avoided, and even a danger to be shunned. For viewed simply as teaching ordinances, intended to represent and inculcate the great principles of truth and duty, they were superseded at the introduction of the gospel by the appointment of other means, more suitable as instruments in the hand of the Spirit for ministering instruction to the minds of men. The change then brought into the divine administration was characterized throughout by a more immediate and direct handling of the things of God. They were now things no longer hid under a vail, but openly disclosed to the eye of the mind. And ordinances, which were adapted to a state of the church, when neither the Spirit was fully given, nor the things of God were clearly revealed, could not pos-

sibly be such as were adapted to the church of the New Testament. The grand ordinance here must be the free and open manifestation of the truth—written first in the word of inspiration, and thenceforth continually proclaimed anew by the preaching of the gospel; and such symbolical institutions as were still needed, must be grafted upon the clear revelations of this word, and like those of the former dispensation, bespeaking a reserve in the truth already revealed, or only a dim apprehension of the better things to come. Hence, the old ritual of service should have fallen into desuetude, whenever the new state of things came in; and the tenacity with which the Judaizing Christians clung to it, was the indication of a very imperfect enlightenment and grovelling taste. So long as they could get the kernel only through the shell, it was their duty to take the one for the sake of the other. But now, when the kernel itself was presented to them in naked simplicity, still to insist upon having the shell along with it, was the clear sign of an unhealthy condition—an undoubted proof that they had not yet come to the full knowledge and appreciation of gospel truth, and were disposed to rest unduly in mere outward observances. The apostle, therefore, on this score alone justly denounces such Judaizers as carnal; and as in spiritual things acting the part of persons who, though of full age, have not put away childish things, but continue in a willing "bondage to the elements of the world."

This, however, was by no means the whole of the misapprehension which such conduct betrayed. For while those ordinances of the former dispensation were in one point of view means of instruction and grace, in another they were signs and acknowledgments of debt. Calling, as they did, continually for acts of atonement and cleansing, and yet presenting nothing that could satisfactorily purge the conscience, they were, even when rigorously performed, testimonies, that the heavy reckoning for guilt was not yet properly met—bonds of obligation for the time relieved, but standing over to some future period for their full and adequate discharge. This discharge in full was given by Christ when he suffered on the cross, and brought in complete satisfaction for all the demands of the violated law. He is, therefore, said to have "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." The charges of guilt and condemnation which that handwriting had been perpetually making against men as transgressors, were now laid in one mass upon the body of the crucified Redeemer, and with its death were for ever abolished. So that those ceremonies being, as Calvin justly terms them, "attestations of men's guilt, and instruments witnessing their liability," "Paul with good reason warned the Colossians, how seriously they would relapse, if they allowed a yoke in that way to be imposed upon them. By so doing, they at the same time deprived themselves of all benefit from Christ, who by his eternal sacrifice once offered, had abolished those daily sacri-

fices, which were indeed powerful to attest sin, but could do nothing to destroy it."* It was in effect to say, that they did not regard the death of Christ as in itself a perfect satisfaction for the guilt of their sins, but required the purifications of the law to make it complete—at once dishonouring Christ, and showing that they took the Old Testament ceremonies for something else than they really were.†

It has sometimes been alleged, that in the case of the Jewish believers there was still a sort of propriety, or even of obligation, in continuing to observe the ceremonies of Moses—until, at least, the epistle to the Hebrews was written, formally discharging them from all further attendance upon such services.‡ But there is no real foundation for such an opinion. It is true, that no express and authoritative injunction was given at first for the discontinuance of those services; but this was done simply in accommodation to their religious prejudices, which might have received too great a shock, and among their unbelieving neighbours excited too outrageous an opposition, if the change had at once been introduced. But so far as obligation and duty were concerned, they should have required no explicit announcement on the subject different from what had already been given in the facts of gospel history. When the vail was rent in twain, abolishing the distinction at the centre, all others of an outward kind of necessity gave way. When the great High Priest had fulfilled his work, no work remained to be done by any other priest. The gospel of shadows was evidently gone, the gospel of realities come. And the compliances which the apostles generally, and Paul himself latterly made (Acts xxi.) to humour the prejudices and silence the senseless clamours of the Jews, though necessary at first, were yet carried to an undue and dangerous length. They palpably failed in Paul's case to accomplish the end in view, and in the case of the Jewish Christians themselves were attended with jealousies, self-

* Inst. B. ii. c. 7, § 17.

† Bell on the Covenants, p. 141, puts this point well: "A handwriting implies two things, viz. that a debt is contracted, and that it is not yet paid. Circumcision, for instance, which stood at the head of all the ceremonies, was as a handwriting in the person's own blood that he was a sinner, and that justice was not yet satisfied, and in every sacrifice the acknowledgment was renewed. Now, to plead for circumcision after Christ had blotted out the handwriting, taken it out of the way and nailed it to his cross, what was this but to cleave to the ceremonies as they stood related to the law, or covenant of works?" &c. Also in regard to the characteristic difference between the ordinances of the two dispensations, and the state of believers in connexion with them, he remarks, p. 286: "Old Testament saints were kept in a comparative kind of bondage, being every now and then obliged to acknowledge, as with their own handwriting, in the blood of the sacrifices, that the broken covenant of works was not yet fulfilled. In their sacrifices there was a remembrance of sin. In our sacraments, especially that of the Supper, there is a remembrance of the Saviour, who has put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. In them there was an acknowledgment of the debt; in this there is a showing of the discharge, a showing forth of the Lord's death." It is of this merely comparative kind of bondage, and the measure of fear necessarily attending it, that the apostle speaks in Rom. viii. 15, "We have not received the spirit of bondage *again* to fear"—implying that this had been theirs in a sense, at least, in which it was not now.

‡ For example, Fraser on Sanct. in the introd. to explication of Rom. vii.

righteous bigotry, growing feebleness, and ultimate decay. "Before Messiah's coming, the ceremonies were as the swaddling bands in which he was wrapt; but after it, they resembled the linen clothes which he left in the grave. Christ was in the one, not in the other. And using them as the Galatians did, or as the Jews do at this day, they and their language are a lie; for they say he is still to come who is come already. They are now beggarly elements, having nothing of Christ, the true riches, in them."*

* Bell on Cov. p. 140.

PART III.

THE RELIGIOUS TRUTHS AND PRINCIPLES EMBODIED IN THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS AND SERVICES OF THE MOSAIC DISPENSATION, CONSIDERED IN THEIR TYPICAL REFERENCE TO THE BETTER THINGS TO COME.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY—ON THE QUESTION WHY MOSES WAS INSTRUCTED IN THE WISDOM OF THE EGYPTIANS, AND WHAT INFLUENCE THIS MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO EXERCISE ON HIS FUTURE LEGISLATION.

THIS point was briefly adverted to in an earlier part of our investigations.* But this is the proper place for a more formal discussion of it, when we are entering on the explanation of the Mosaic symbols of worship and service. That an acquaintance with Egyptian learning was advantageous to Moses, to the extent formerly stated, no one will be disposed to question. Whatever might be its peculiar character, it would at least serve the purpose of expanding and ripening the faculties of his youthful mind—would render him acquainted with the general principles and methods of political government—would furnish him with an insight into the religious and moral system of the most intelligent and civilized nation of heathen antiquity—and so, would not only increase his fitness, in an intellectual point of view, for holding the high commission that was to be intrusted to him, but would also lend to the commission itself, when bestowed, the recommendation, which superior rank or learning ever yields, when devoted to a sacred use.

Such advantages, it is obvious, Moses might derive from his Egyptian education, irrespective altogether of the precise quality of the wisdom, with which he thus became acquainted. It is another question, how far he might be indebted to that wisdom itself, as an essential element in his preparation—or to what extent the things belonging to it might be allowed to mould and regulate the institutions which he was commissioned to impose on Israel. Scripture throws no direct light upon this question; it affords materials only for general inferences and probable conclusions; and yet the view we actually entertain on the subject will evidently tell

* P. 1. c. 2.

in no small degree upon the spirit in which we investigate the whole Mosaic system, and give a distinctive colouring to our interpretations of many of its parts.

I. The opinion was undoubtedly very prevalent among the Christian fathers, that no small portion of the institutions of Moses were borrowed from those of Egypt, and were adopted as divine ordinances only in accommodation to the low and carnal state of the Israelites, who had become inveterately attached to the manners of Egypt. With the view, it was supposed, of weaning them more easily from the errors and corruptions which had grown upon them there, the Lord indulged them with the retention of many of the customs of Egypt, though in themselves indifferent or even somewhat objectionable, and gave a place in his own worship to what they had hitherto seen associated with the service of idols.* Spencer, supporting himself by these authorities, and by a distorted interpretation of one or two passages of Scripture, has, with great learning and industry, (in his work De Legis Hebræorum,) endeavoured to make good the proposition, that the immediate and proper design of the Mosaic law was to abolish idolatry and

* See the references in Spencer, De Leg. Hebr. L. i. c. 1. They rarely enter into particulars, and never, that we know, formally discuss the grounds of their opinion; but very commonly think it enough to refer in support of it to Ez. xx. 25, where the Lord is said to have given Israel "statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." This passage is also much pressed by Spencer, and indeed, is the main authority of a scriptural nature to which both he, and after him Warburton (Div. Legation, B. iv. c. 6,) appeal in confirmation of their general view of the Mosaic ritual. By a palpable misunderstanding of the meaning of the prophet, they regard the Decalogue as the statutes in themselves really and properly good, for breaking which in the wilderness, others, namely, the ceremonial observances, were imposed on them: "Because they had violated my *first* system of laws, the Decalogue—I added to them my *second* system, the ritual law, very aptly characterized (when set in opposition to the moral law) by statutes that were not good, and by judgments whereby they should not live."—(Warburton.) In our judgment, most *inaptly* so characterized; for certainly they could least of all have lived by the moral law, which, as the apostle testifies, brings the knowledge of sin, and the judgment of death; and whatever life they had, must rather have come by the ritual, than the moral law. Besides, Moses had got all the instruction regarding the tabernacle and its ordinances before the revolt took place about the golden calf; so that the tabernacle-worship went before this, and was no after-thought, resorted to in consequence of the revolt. But it is quite beside the purpose of the prophet to compare one part of the law with another; "it is impossible that he could, especially after his own declarations regarding the law, designate it by such terms; the laws not good, bringing death and destruction, are opposed to those of God; they are the heathen observances which were arbitrarily put in the room of the other."—(Hävernick.) So also Calvin, Vitringa, Obs. Sacræ, L. ii. c. l. § 17. Indeed, Jerome, though he hesitates as to the proper meaning, has correctly enough expressed it in these words: "Hoc est, dimisit eos cogitationibus, et desiderus suis, ut facerent quæ non conveniunt." Parallel is Ps. lxxxi. 12: "So I gave them up to their own hearts' lusts, and they walked in their own counsels;" Acts vii. 42, "He gave them up to worship the host of heaven;" Rom. i. 24, 2 Thess. ii. 11.—Deyling has an acute dissertation on this passage (Obs. Sac. p. ii. ch. 23,) in which he very successfully refutes the interpretation of the Fathers, Spencer, and those of later times, who substantially adopt his view, but also objects to the view given of it here, and contends, that the statutes not good, and the laws by which they could not live, were God's chastisements, punishing them for their violations of his good and life-giving ordinances. We have no doubt that these chastisements were in the eye of the prophet, but not to the exclusion of the other: God gave them up to foolish counsels and a reprobate mind, that they might manifestly appear to be undeserving of his care, and be left to inherit the recompense that was meet for their perversity.

preserve the Israelites in the worship of the one true God; and that, for the better effecting of this purpose, the Lord introduced many heathenish, chiefly Egyptian, customs, into his service, and so changed or rectified others, as to convert them into a bulwark against idolatry. He coupled with this, no doubt, a secondary design, "the mystic and typical reasons," as he calls it, that, namely, of adumbrating the better things of the gospel. But this occupies such an inferior and subordinate place, and is occasionally spoken of in such disparaging terms, that one cannot avoid the conviction of his having held it in very small estimation. He even represents this mystical reference to higher things than those immediately concerned, as done partly in accommodation to the early bent given to the mind of Moses.* And of course, when he comes to particulars, it is only in regard to a few things of greater prominence, such as the tabernacle, the ark, and the more important institutions, that he can deem it advisable to search for any mystical meaning whatever; to go more minutely to work he characterizes as a kind of "sporting with sacred things;" and declares his concurrence in a sentiment of St. Chrysostom, that "all such things were but venerable and illustrious memorials of Jewish ignorance and stupidity."†

It is not so much, however, in this depreciation of the symbolical and typical import of the Mosaic ritual, that the work of Spencer was fitted to give a false impression of its real character and object, as in the connexion he necessarily sought to establish, while endeavouring to prove his main proposition, between the institutions of Moses and the rites of heathenism. Though charged with a divine commission, Moses appears, in point of fact, only as an improved Egyptian, and his whole religious system is nothing more than a refinement on the customs and polity of Egypt. Not a few of the rites introduced were useless (legibus et ritibus inutilibus, p. 26,) some were viewed as only tolerable fooleries (quos ineptias norat esse tolerabiles, p. 640,) and would never have found a place in the institutions of Moses, but for the currency they had already obtained in Egypt, and the liking the Israelites had there acquired for them. But on such a view it is impossible to conceive how to worship God according to the ritual of Moses, could have been a worship in spirit and in truth, and the very imposition of such a ritual in the name of God, must have been a kind of pious fraud. "God," to use the language of Baehr, "God appears as a Jesuit, who makes use of bad means to accomplish a good end. Spencer, for example, considers sacrifice as an invention of religious barbarity, an evidence of superstitious views of the divine nature; now, when God by Moses, not only confirmed for ever the offerings already in common use, but also extended and enlarged the sacrificial code, instead of thereby extirpating the mistaken views, he would really have sanctioned and most strongly enforced them... Besides, the relation of Israel to

* Ibid. p. 210. † Ibid. p. 215.

the Egyptians, and that in particular of Moses, as represented in the Pentateuch at the time of the Exodus, would lead us to expect an intentional shunning of every thing Egyptian, especially in religious matters, rather than an imitation and borrowing. The deliverance of Israel from Egypt is set forth as the special token of divine love and power, as the greatest salvation wrought for Israel, as the peculiar pledge of the covenant with Jehovah; and a separate feast was devoted to this commemoration of divine goodness. It is unquestionable that there was here every inducement for Moses making the separation of Israel from Egypt as broad as possible. For this, however, it was indispensably necessary to brand every thing properly Egyptian, and extirpate by all means the very remembrance of it. But by adopting the Egyptian ritual, Moses would have directly sanctioned what was Egyptian, and would have perpetuated the remembrance of the land of darkness and servitude."*

Indeed, the objectionable character of Spencer's views could scarcely be better exposed than in the words of Lord Bolingbroke, when railing in his usual style against the current theology of his day: "In order to preserve the purity of his worship, God prescribes to them a multitude of rites and ceremonies, founded on the superstitions of Egypt, from which they were to be weaned, or in some analogy to them. They were never weaned entirely from all the superstitions: and the great merit of the law of Moses was teaching the people to adore one God, much as the idolatrous nations adored several. This may be called *sanctifying* Pagan rites and ceremonies in theological language, but it is profaning the pure worship of God in the language of common sense."†

But while Spencer's views lay open to such formidable objections, and were opposed to the more serious theology of the age, they gradually made way both in this country and on the Continent; and the influence of his work may be traced through a very large portion of the theological literature connected with the Old Testament down even to a recent period. The work owed this extraordinary success to the immense pains that had been bestowed upon it—its exact method, comprehensive plan, and lucid expres-

* Symbolik, B. i. s. 41, 42. The latter part is stated rather too comprehensively, as we shall show by and by. The circumstances were such as to have led Moses rather to avoid than to seek an imitation of what was Egyptian, but it was impossible altogether to exclude it, or precisely to brand every thing properly Egyptian.

† Philosophical Works, vol. v. p. 377. It is well remarked by Archbishop Magee, that Spencer's work "has always been resorted to by infidel writers, in order to wing their shafts more effectively against the Mosaic revelation." See note 60 to his work on the Atonement, where also are to be found some good remarks on such views generally, although, in resting upon the ground of Witsius, he does not place the opposition to them on its proper basis. He speaks of Tillotson as having been beforehand with Spencer in propounding the general view regarding the nature of the Mosaic ritual, and certainly Barrow (in his Sermon on the Imperfection of the Jewish Religion,) exhibits to the full as low a view of the legislation of Moses as Spencer himself did shortly afterwards. We have no doubt that the view itself was an offshoot of the sort of semi-deistical philosophy which sprung up at that period in England as a kind of reaction from Puritanism, and insinuated itself into various opinions of the more learned theologians.

sion—also to the great skill which the author displayed in availing himself of all the learning then accessible upon the subject, and bringing it to bear upon the general argument. His views were eagerly embraced on the Continent by Le Clerc, and (in his work on the Pentateuch,) pushed to consequences from which Spencer himself would have shrunk. Then Michaelis came with his masculine intellect, his stores of oriental learning, but low and worldly sense, discovering so many sanatary, medicinal, political, and, in short, all kinds of reasons but moral and religious ones, for the laws and institutions of Moses, that if the Jewish lawgiver was in some measure vindicated from the charge of accommodating his policy to heathenish notions and customs, it was only to establish for him the equally questionable reputation of a well-skilled Egyptian sage, or a thorough-bred worldly legislator. In this case, as well as in the other, it was impossible to avoid the conviction, that it was somewhat out of character to claim for Moses a properly divine commission, and quite incredible that signs and wonders should have been wrought by Heaven to confirm and establish it. After such pioneers, the way was open for the subtle explanations of rationalism, and the rude assaults of avowed infidelity.*

In Britain the influence of Spencer's work has also been very marked, though, from the character of the national mind, and other counteracting influences, the results were not so directly and extensively pernicious. The more learned works that have since issued from the press, connected with the interpretation of the Books of Moses, have for the most part borne no unequivocal indications of the weight of Spencer's name; while the better convictions, and the more practical aim of the authors, generally kept them from embracing his views in all their grossness, and carrying them out to their legitimate conclusions. Even Warburton, who espouses in its full extent Spencer's view regarding the primary and immediate design of the Mosaic institutions, as being intended to "preserve the doctrine of the unity by means of institutions partly in compliance to their Egyptian prejudices, and partly in opposition to those and the like superstitions,"†—yet gives a decidedly higher place to the typical bearing of the Mosaic ritual, and comes much nearer the truth in representing both its religious use under the Old Testament dispensation, and its prospective reference to the New.‡ Such writers as Lowman,§ and Shaw,‖ gave only a partial and reluctant assent to some of Spencer's positions; and chiefly, it would seem, because they did not see how to dispose of his proofs and authorities. The latter, in particular, though he afterwards substantially grants what Spencer contended for, yet expresses his dissatisfaction with the general

* Michaelis did not himself positively avow his disbelief of the miraculous in the history of Moses, but he plainly betrayed his anxiety to get rid of it as far as possible by his questions to Niebuhr in regard to the passage through the Red Sea.

† Divine Leg., B. iv. s. 6, and v. s. 1.

‡ Ibid. B. vi. s. 5 and 6.

§ Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship.

‖ Philosophy of Judaism.

aim of Spencer's work, by saying, that "upon the whole he was still apt to imagine, that however it might have been one part of the Divine purpose to guard Israel against a corruption from the Egyptian idolatry, by the institution of Mosaic economy, this was not the principal design of it." It would have been strange, indeed, if such had been its principal design. And strange it certainly was, that men, not to say of penetration and learning, but with their eyes open, could ever have imagined that it was so. For what do we not see, when we direct our view to the latter days of the Jewish commonwealth? We see this end most completely attained. A people never existed that were more firmly established in the doctrine of the unity, and more thoroughly alienated from the superstitions of heathenism; and yet never were a people more thoroughly and generally estranged from the true knowledge of God, and more hostile to the claims of Heaven. So that, in adopting the hypothesis in question, one must be prepared to maintain the monstrous proposition, that the principal and primary design of that religious economy might have been accomplished, while still the persons subject to it were neither true worshippers of the living God, nor fitted to enter into the kingdom of his Son.*

2. A widely different, and in many respects precisely opposite view of the institutions of Moses, has also been maintained. Its chief expounder and advocate, as opposed to Spencer, was Witsius, whose Ægyptiaca was published with the express design of meeting the arguments and counteracting the influence of the work of Spencer.† In this production, Witsius admits at the outset, that there is a striking similarity between the rites of the Mosaic law and those of other ancient nations, in particular of the Egyptians; and he even quotes with approbation a passage from Kircher, in

* This also applies to the other reason commonly assigned by the writers in question for the rites of Judaism—the separation of the people from the other nations of the earth. Besides, from the very nature of things, this could not have been more than an incidental and temporary end. The covenant, out of which all Judaism grew, containing the promise, that in the seed of Abraham all the families of the earth should be blessed, it could never be the direct intention and design of the ordinances connected with it, to place them in a sort of antagonism to the other nations. This effect was no farther to have been produced than by the Israelites becoming too holy for intercourse with the nations; in so far as this distinction did not exist, both were substantially the same, the Israelites uncircumcised and heathen; and the circumstance of their being placed under such sanctifying ordinances was rather designed to have a salutary influence on the surrounding heathen, and draw them to seek after the same. Hence, Deut. xxxii. 43: "Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people;" and Isa. lvi. 7, "Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people."

† Spencer's work called forth many other opponents, but Witsius still held by much the first place. The Ægyptiaca was followed by a respectable work of Meyer, De Temporibus et Festis diebus Hebræorum—the first part against Sir John Marsham, the second against Spencer, taking up substantially the same ground as Witsius. Vitringa also opposes the leading views of Spencer, in various parts of his Obs. Sacræ, as does Deyling also, in his Obs. Sac. In this country, Shuckford in the first vol. of his Connexion of Sacred and Profane History, and Graves in his Lectures on the Pentateuch (he has only one lecture on the subject, P. ii. Lec. v.,) with various other writers of inferior note, have opposed Spencer, on the ground of Witsius, and without adding to its strength. Daubeny's Connexion between the Old and the New Testament, though praised by Magee in his notes on this subject, does not touch on the controversy, and, in a critical point of view, is an inferior work.

which this similarity is asserted to have been so manifest, that "either the Egyptians must have Hebraized, or the Hebrews must have Egyptized." Nor does he think it improbable that this may have been the reason why the Egyptian and Jewish rites were so often classed together at Rome, and enactments made for restraining them as alike pernicious.* But he contends, at the same time, that some of the things in which this resemblance stood, were not peculiar to the Egyptians, but common to them with other nations of heathen antiquity; and especially, that in so far as there might be any borrowing in the case, it was more likely the Egyptians borrowed from the Hebrews, than the Hebrews from the Egyptians. His positions were generally acquiesced in by the more orthodox and evangelical divines of this country; and it is a somewhat singular fact, that the commencement of a false theology in regard to the Old Testament, had its rise in this country, and this country itself derived the chief corrective against the evil from abroad. In two important respects, however, the argument of Witsius was not satisfactory, and failed to provide a sufficient antidote to the work of Spencer. 1. He failed in proving, or even in rendering it probable, that the Egyptians borrowed from the Israelites the rites and ceremonies, in which the customs of the two nations resembled each other. Warburton is quite successful here in meeting the positions of Witsius and his followers, both on account of the unquestionable antiquity of the Egyptian institutions, and the want of any such connexion between the two nations as to render a borrowing on the part of the Egyptians from the Israelites in the least degree likely. And the more recent investigations which have been made into the history and condition of ancient Egypt, by such writers as Heeren, Rossellini, and Wilkinson, have given such confirmation to the views of Warburton, in this respect, that they may now be regarded as conclusively established. It is not only against probability, but we may even say against the well authenticated facts of history, to allege, that the Egyptians had to any extent borrowed from the Israelites. 2. If in this respect the argument of Witsius was erroneous, in another it was defective; it made no attempt to supply what had partly occasioned the work of Spencer, and certainly contributed much to its success—a more solid and better-grounded system of typology. This still remained as arbitrary and capricious in its expositions of Old Testament events and institutions as it had been before—like a nose of wax, as Spencer somewhere sneeringly, though not without reason, terms it, which might be bent any way one pleased. Orthodox divines should, as Hengstenberg remarks, "have directed all their powers to a fundamental and profitable investigation into the symbolical and typical meaning of the ceremonial institutions."† But not having done this, though they succeeded in weakening some of Spencer's statements, and proving the connexion between the Jewish and Egyptian customs to be less in certain cases than

* Lib. i. c. 2.

† Authentie, I. p. 8.

he imagined, yet his system, as a whole, had the advantage of an apparently settled and consistent foundation, while theirs seemed to swim only in doubt and uncertainty.

3. In recent times, considerable advances have been made toward the supplying of this deficiency on the part of Witsius and his followers. Much praise is due, especially to Baehr, for having laid the foundation of a more profound and systematic explanation of the symbols of the Mosaic dispensation, although, from some radical defects in his doctrinal views, the meaning he brings out is often far from being satisfactory. On the particular point now under consideration, he substantially agrees with Witsius, holding the institutions of Moses to have been in no respect derived from Egypt; but differing so far, that he conceives the Egyptians to have been as little indebted to the Israelites, as the Israelites to the Egyptians. He maintains, that whatever similarity existed between their respective institutions, arose from the necessity of employing like symbols to express like ideas, which rendered a certain degree of similarity in all symbolical religions unavoidable. "Even if we should grant," he says, "a direct borrowing in particular cases, why should not the lawgiver have adopted that, which appeared formally suitable to him? The natural and the sensible is by no means in itself heathenish, and the sensible things of which the heathens availed themselves, to represent religious ideas, did not become in the least heathenish from having been applied to such a use. The main inquiry still is, what was indicated by these signs, and that not merely in the particulars, but pre-eminently in their combination into one entire system. Besides, no case is known to us, in which any such borrowing can with certainty be proved."* "The investigations," he again says," "recently prosecuted in such a variety of ways into the religions of the eastern nations show, that what was formerly regarded as peculiarly Egyptian in the religion of Moses, is also to be found among other nations of the East, especially amongst the Indians, and yet nobody would maintain, that Moses borrowed his ceremonial institutions from India."† Unquestionably not; but there may still be sufficient ground for holding, that, without travelling to India to see what was there, he took what suited his purpose near at hand. Besides, Hengstenberg, in his Egypt and the Books of Moses, has endeavoured to prove—and in some cases we think has successfully proved, that there are distinct traces to be found in the laws of Moses of Egyptian usages, and that Baehr is not borne out by his authorities, in alleging the same usages to have existed elsewhere. We are disposed, therefore, to regard Baehr's position as somewhat extreme; and on the whole subject of the Egyptian education of Moses, and the influence this might warrantably be supposed to exert upon the institutions he was afterwards honoured to introduce,—a subject not formally discussed by either of these authors—we submit the following propositions as at once grounded in reason and borne out by the analogy of the divine procedure.

* Symbolik, i. p. 34. † Ib. p. 42.

1. It is, in the first instance, to be held as a sacred principle, that whatever might be the acquaintance Moses possessed with the customs and learning of Egypt, this could in no case be the direct and formal reason of his imposing any thing as an obligation on the Israelites. For the whole, and every part of his work, he had a commission from above, and nothing was admitted into his institutions, which did not first approve itself to divine wisdom, and carry with it the sanction of divine authority. "When the Lord was going to found a new commonwealth, as it was really new, he wished it also to appear such to the Israelites. Hence, its form or appearance, not as fabricated from the rubbish of Canaanite or Egyptian superstitions, but as let down from heaven, was first shown to Moses on the sacred mount, that every thing in Israel might be ordered and settled after that pattern. Nor did he wish liberty to be granted to the people, to determine by their own judgment even the smallest points in religion. He determined all things himself, even to the minutest circumstances: so that on pain of instant death, they were forbidden either to omit or to change any thing. Thus, it became the majesty of the supreme God to subdue his people to himself, not by the wiles of a tortuous and crooked policy, but by a royal path, the simple exercise of his own authority; and so, to accustom them from the first to lay aside all carnal considerations, and to take the will alone of their King and Lord as their common rule in all things."* The passage in Deut. xii. 30—32, is alone sufficient to establish the truth of this: "Take heed, that thou inquire not after their gods (viz. of the nations of Canaan,) saying, How did these nations serve their gods? even so will I do likewise. Thou shalt not do so unto the Lord thy God; for every abomination to the Lord, which he hateth, have they done unto their gods. What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it."

That in point of fact, there was a marked difference between the religious customs and sacrificial system of the Israelites, and those of other nations, sufficient to stamp theirs as peculiarly their own, even heathen writers have in the strongest terms affirmed.† That it would be so, was implied in the declaration of Moses to Pharaoh, when he insisted upon being allowed to leave the land of Egypt, lest "they should sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians." In whatever respects this might be the case—whether in the kind of victims offered, or in the manner of doing it, the statement at least indicates a strong contrariety between the worship to be instituted among them, and that already established amongst the Egyptians. And in the further statement of Moses: "We shall sacrifice to the Lord our God as he shall command us," (Ex. viii. 27,) he grounds their entire worship, whether it might in some respects resemble or differ from that of the Egyptians, on the sole and absolute authority of God.

* Witsius, Ægyptiaca, L. iii. c. 14, § 3.

† Moses, quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret, novos ritus, contrariosque cæteris mortalibus, indidit. Profana illic omnia, qua apud nos sacra, &c.—Tacitus, Hist., L. v. 4, also Plin. H. N. xiii. 4.

2. But as the laws and institutions which God prescribes to his people in any particular age, must be wisely adapted to the times and circumstances in which they live, so it is impossible but that the fact of the lawgiver of the Jewish people having been instructed in all the wisdom of the most civilized nation of antiquity, must have to some extent modified both the civil and religious polity of which he was instrumentally the author. No man legislates in the abstract, but with a careful and considerate adaptation to the present state and aspect of society; and this always the more, the higher the skill and wisdom of the legislator. Moses, it must be remembered, did not stand alone in his connexion with what was counted wise and polished among the Egyptians; he only possessed in a more eminent degree what belonged also in some degree to his brethren. And that the people for whom he was to legislate had grown up in a civilized country, and an artificial state of society, familiar, at least, with the results of Egyptian learning, if but little initiated into the learning itself, would require to be met by a corresponding advancement in the whole structure of his dispensation. For, what was needed to develope and express either the civil or the religious life of a people so reared, would in many respects differ from what might have suited a rude and uncultivated horde. So that a certain regard to the state of things in Egypt was absolutely necessary in the Hebrew polity, if it was to possess a suitable adaptation to the real progress of society in the arts and manners of civilized life. To instance only in one particular—the knowledge of the art of writing must alone have exercised a most material influence on the code of laws prescribed to this new people. Where such an art is unknown, the laws must necessarily be few, the institutions natural and simple, and the degree of instruction connected with them of the most elementary nature—such as oral tradition might be sufficient to preserve, or the verses of some popular bard to teach. But if, on the other hand, the legislation is for a people among whom writing is known and familiarly used, it will naturally embrace a much wider range, and branch itself out into a far greater variety of particulars. Nor can we doubt that, for this reason, among others, the Israelites were associated with the manners of Egypt, and Moses was from his youth instructed in all its learning. For, whatever mystery hangs over the first invention of letters, there can no longer be any doubt, that Egypt was the country where the art of writing was first brought into general practice, and that at a period long prior to the birth of Moses. But, without an intimate and familiar acquaintance with this art, Moses could not have delivered such a system of laws as constituted the framework of his dispensation—which, from their multiplicity, could not otherwise have been remembered, and from their prevailing character, as opposed to the corrupt tendencies of the people, the people themselves were but too willing to forget. It was therefore necessary that they should all be written, and that what was pre-eminently *the law*, should even be engraved, for the sake of greater durability, upon tables

of stone. All this implies a certain amount of learning on the part of the lawgiver, as requisite to fit him for being instrumentally the author of such a dispensation, and a certain influence necessarily exerted by his learning on his legislation. It implies, also, a considerable degree of civilization on the part of the people whose circumstances were such as to admit of and call for such a legislator.*

3. We can very easily, however, advance a step farther, and

* We have already spoken, toward the close of chap. i., of the connexion between the civilization of the Israelites, and the ultimate purposes of God in respect to them. The particular point more especially noticed in the text here,—the existence and familiar use of the art of writing in Egypt, at the time of Israel's sojourn there, has given rise to a good deal of controversy, but is now virtually settled, so far as our immediate purpose is concerned. How alphabetical writing was invented, or by whom, or whether it was not transmitted from the ages before the flood, and might consequently be claimed by each of the more eminent races or nations that afterwards arose as their own, these are still unexplored mysteries, and likely to remain such. The opinion is now very prevalent, that the invention belongs to Egypt, and grew out of a gradual improvement of the original hieroglyphic or picture-writing. So especially Warburton, Div. Leg. B. iv. s. 4, and many of the recent writers on hieroglyphics. See the Article Hieroglyphics, in Encylop. Britan. and Heeren's introduction to the second vol. on Africa. But this opinion is by no means universal, and it stands connected with such difficulties, that some of those who have devoted most attention to the subject, hold the order of things to have been precisely the reverse. They conceive that the most complicated was also the last, that out of the alphabetical writing came the phonetic hieroglyphic, and this again gave rise to the ideographic and figurative. So, in part at least, Zoega, also Klaproth, Latronne, and Hengstenberg, who remarks, in confirmation of this view, that "the hieroglyphic writing was exclusively a sacred one, and hence conveys the impression, that it was intended to darken what already existed in a simple form; if we seek in hieroglyphic writing the commencement of writing in general, we can scarcely comprehend how it should from the first have been exclusively employed by the priests" (Authentie, des Pent. i. p. 444, 6, where also see quotations from the other writers mentioned as holding this view.) But however this may be, it is certain that the knowledge and use of letter-writing reaches back to a period beyond all authentic profane history, and dates from the very infancy of the human race. Hence, by most early nations, the invention of it was ascribed to one of their gods—by the Phœnicians to Thaaut, by the Egyptians to Thot or Hermes, &c. The fact, also, that a person, whether personally designated, or characterized by the name of Cadmus, a supposed contemporary of Moses, brought letters from Phœnicia to Greece, is a sufficient proof that letter-writing was then in current use in the East. Even Winer (Real-Wört. art. Screib-Kunst) admits that Moses might *possibly* have become acquainted with it in Egypt. The Greek writers, Diodorus (iii. c. 3,) Plato (De Leg. L. vii.) speak of it as customary in Egypt for the multitude learning letters; and the name given by Herodotus to the alphabetic kind of writing, *demotic* (popular,) and by Clemens and Porphyry, *epistolic*, implies it to have been generally known and used. "In Egypt," says Wilkinson, "nothing was done without writing. Scribes were employed on all occasions, whether to settle public or private questions, and no bargain of any consequence was made without the voucher of a written document," (Vol. i. p. 183.) He tells us also, that papyri of the most remote Pharaonic period have been found with the same mode of writing as that of the age of Cheops (Vol. iii. p. 150.) Rossellini says, that "they probably wrote more in ancient Egypt, and on more ordinary occasions than among us"—that "the steward of the house kept a written register"—that "their names used to be inscribed upon their implements and garments"—that "in levying soldiers, persons wrote down the names as the commanders brought the men up," &c. (Vol. ii. p. 241, ss.) That this accords with the representations given in the Pentateuch, and that the Israelites partook in the privilege, is evident from the name given to the officers both in Egypt and Canaan, *shoterim*, or scribes (Ex. v. 15; Deut. xx. 5,) and also from the very frequent references to writing in the books of Moses, for example, Ex. xxxii. 16; Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20, xxvii. where they were enjoined to have the whole law written upon stones covered with chalk or plaster (according to a practice common in Egypt, Wilkinson, iii. p. 300,) that all might see it and read it.

perceive how a still more direct and intimate connexion might in some respects be legitimately, and even advantageously established between the state of matters in Egypt, and that introduced by Moses among the Israelites. In things, for example, required for the maintenance of a due order and discipline among the people, or for the becoming support of the ministers and ordinances of religion—things, which human nature is disposed, if not altogether to shun, at least improperly to curtail and limit, it might have been the part of the highest wisdom to take substantially the arrangements, which already existed in Egypt. For as these must, from their very nature, have imposed a kind of yoke upon the Israelites, the thought, that the same had been borne even by the depraved and idolatrous people from whom they were now separated, would the more easily reconcile them to its obligations. This is a principle, which we find recognised and acted on in gospel times. There must be self-denial, and a readiness to undergo labour and fatigue in the Christian; and this the apostle enforces by a reference to the toils of the husbandman, the hardships of the soldier, and even the pains-taking laborious diligence of the combatant in the Grecian games (2 Tim. ii. 3, 6; 1 Cor. ix. 24.) There must be a decent maintenance provided for those who devote their time and talents to the spiritual work of the ministry; and the reasonableness and propriety of this, he in part grounds on what was usually done amongst men in the commonest occupations of life, as well as the custom, prevalent alike among Jews and Gentiles, for those who ministered at the altar to live of the altar (1 Cor. ix. 7, 14, x. 21.) It was absolutely necessary, however distasteful it might be to men of corrupt minds, that proper means should be employed in the church for the preservation of order, and the enforcement of a wholesome discipline; and the state of things among the Gentiles is appealed to as in itself constituting a call to attend to this, sufficient even to shame the churches into its observance (1 Cor. v., xi. 1, 16.) Not only so, but the officers appointed in the Christian church to take charge of its internal administration, and preside over its worship and discipline, it is well-known, were substantially derived, even to their very names, from those of the Jewish synagogue, which had no properly divine origin, but gradually arose out of the exigencies of the times:—the Holy Spirit choosing in this respect to make use of what was known and familiar to the minds of the disciples, rather than to invent an entirely new order of things.*

We should not, therefore, be surprised to find the application of this principle in the Mosaic dispensation—to find that some things

* Abrogata templi liturgia et cultu, utpote ceremoniali, cultum atque publicam Dei adorationem in Synagogis, quæ quidem moralis erat, Deus in ecclesiam transplantavit Christianam, publicum scilicet ministerum, etc. Hinc ipsissima nomina ministrorum evangelii, *Angelus ecclesiæ*, atque *Episcopus*, quæ ministrorum in Synagogis, &c. Lightfooti, Op. ii. p. 279. But the full and satisfactory proof is to be found only in Vitringa, De Synagoga Vet. in the third part of which it is demonstrated, that the form of government and ministry belonging to the Synagogues was transferred to the Christian church.

there, especially of the kind supposed, bore a substantial conformity to those of Egypt. The officers, or shoterim, mentioned in the xxth ch. of Deuteronomy, were evidently of this class. And such also were some of the arrangements respecting the apportionment of the land, and the support out of its produce of those who were regarded more especially as the representatives of God. In these respects there was the closest resemblance between the Egyptian and Jewish polities, and in the points in which they agreed, they differed from all the other nations of antiquity with which we are acquainted. It is an ascertained fact, confirmed by the reports of the Greek historians, that the king was regarded as sole proprietor of the land in Egypt, with the exception of what belonged to the priests, and that the cultivators were properly farmers under the king. Diodorus, indeed, (L. i. 73,) represents the military caste as having also a share in the land; and Wilkinson (vol. i. p. 263,) says, that kings, priests, and the military order, these, but these only, appear to have been land-owners. Herodotus, however, explains this apparent contradiction in regard to the military order, by stating (B. ii. § 141) that their land properly belonged to the king; that they differed from the common cultivators only in holding it free of rent, and in lieu of wages; that hence, while it had been given them by one king, it had been taken away by another. He also mentions that not only had the priests property in land connected with the temples, in which they served, but also that they had allowances furnished them out of the public or royal treasures, and along with the soldiers received a salary from the king, (ii. 37, 168.) These are very striking peculiarities, and, as Hengstenberg justly remarks,* imply, at least in regard to the king's proprietorship in the land, a historical fact through which it was brought about. We have such a fact in the history of Joseph, (Gen. xlvii.) when he bought the land for Pharaoh, but rented it out again to the people on condition of their paying a fifth of the produce, with the exception, however, of the land of the priests, whose land Pharaoh had no opportunity, indeed, of purchasing, because they had a stated allowance from his stores.

It is, perhaps, not too much to say that one of the reasons why this singular state of things was introduced into Egypt by the instrumentality of Joseph, was, that a similar arrangement in regard to the land of Canaan might the more readily be gone into on the part of the Israelites. The similarity is too striking to have been the result of any thing but an intentional copying from the Egyptian constitution. For in the Jewish commonwealth God is represented as king, to whom the whole land belonged, and the people only as tenants under him—obliged, also, by the tenure on which they held it, to yield two-tenths or a fifth of the yearly produce unto God, who again provided out of this fifth for the support of the priests and Levites, the widow and the orphan, his peculiar representatives.† This large contribution from the regular increase

* Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 62, Trans.

† Deut. xviii.; Lev. xxv., comp. also Michaelis' Laws of Moses, vol. ii. p. 258, and Hengstenberg's Authentie, ii. p. 401, ss.

of the land was necessary for the proper administration of divine ordinances, and the beneficent support of those who, according to the plan adopted, had no other resources to trust to for their comfortable maintenance. But it implied too entire a dependence upon God, and exacted too much at their hands to meet with a ready compliance. And it was not only compatible, but we should rather say in perfect accordance with the highest wisdom, to adopt an arrangement for securing it, which was thus grounded in the history and constitution of Egypt, rather than to contrive one altogether new. For it thus came to them on its first proposal recommended and sanctioned by ancient usage. And the thought was obvious, that if the citizens even of a heathen empire, in consideration of a great act of kindness in the time of famine, gave so much to their earthly sovereign, and held so dependently of him, it was meet that *they* should willingly yield the same to the God who had redeemed them, and freely bestowed upon them every thing they possessed.

In these, and probably some other matters of a similar kind, we can easily understand how the Egyptian learning of Moses, without the slightest derogation to his Divine commission, might be turned to valuable account in executing the work given him to do. Nor have we any reason to suppose that the divine direction and counsel imparted to him, superseded the light he had obtained, or the benefit he had derived by his opportunities of becoming acquainted with the internal affairs of Egypt.

4. But there is a still farther point of connexion between the Egyptian learning of Moses, coupled with the Egyptian training of the people, and what might justly be expected in the institutions under which they were to be placed, and one still more directly bearing on the religious aspect of the dispensation. For the handwriting of ordinances brought in by Moses was throughout of a symbolical or teaching nature. But a symbol is a kind of language, and can no more than what we commonly understand by the term be framed arbitrarily, but must grow up and form itself out of the elements which are furnished by the field of nature or art, and be gathered from it by daily observation and experience. The language which we use as the common vehicle of our thoughts, and which forms the medium of our most hallowed intercourse with heaven, is constructed, we may say, from the world of sin and sorrow around us, and if viewed as to its origin, savours of things common and unclean. But in its use simply as a vehicle of thought, or a medium of intercourse, it is not the less fitted to utter the sentiments of our heart, and convey even our loftiest aspirations to heaven. Why should it be thought to be otherwise with the language of symbol? This too must have its foundation to a great extent in nature and custom, in observation and experience; for as it is addressed to the eye, it must, to be intelligible, employ the signs, which, by previous use, the eye is able to read and understand. How should I imagine that white, as a symbol, represents purity, or crimson, guilt, unless something in my past history or observa-

tion had taught me to regard the one as a fit emblem of the other? It would not in the least mar the natural import of the symbol, or destroy its aptitude to express, even on the most solemn occasions, the idea with which it has become associated in my mind, if I should have learned its meaning amid employments not properly sacred, or the practices of a forbidden superstition. No matter how acquired, the bond of connexion exists in my mind between the external symbol and the spiritual idea; and to reject its religious use, because I may have seen it abused to purposes of superstition, would not be more reasonable than to have proscribed every epithet in the language of Greece or Rome, which had been appropriated to the worship and service of idolatry.

Now, it so happened in the providence of God, that the children of Israel were brought into contact with the religious rites and usages of a people deeply imbued, no doubt, with a spirit of depravity and superstition, but abounding, at the same time, with symbolical devices and ordinances. And it was in the nature of things impossible that another religion abounding with the same could be framed, without adopting to a large extent the signs with which, from the accident of their position, they had become familiar. The religion introduced might differ—in point of fact it did differ from that already established, as far as light from darkness, in regard to the spirit they respectively breathed and the great ends they aimed at. But being alike symbolical, the one must avail itself of the signs which the other had already seized upon as fitted to express to the eye certain ideas. This had become, so to speak, the current language, which might to some extent be modified and improved, but could not be dispensed with. And as such language consists, for the most part, of a figurative use of the sensible things of nature, the assertion of Baehr is undoubtedly correct, that a very large proportion of the symbols so employed must be common to all religions of a like nature. Yet as each nation also has its peculiarities of thought, of custom, of scenery, of art and commerce, it can scarcely fail to have some corresponding peculiarities of symbolical expression. And it should by no means surprise us—it is rather in accordance with just and rational expectation, if, since the Egyptians were in various respects so peculiar a people, and the Israelites in general, and Moses in particular, had been brought into such close and intimate connexion with their entire system, the symbols of the Jewish worship should in some points bear a resemblance to those of Egypt, which cannot be traced in those of any other nation of heathen antiquity.

Such in reality is the case—as will afterwards appear—and I find in it a mark, not of suspicion, but of credibility and truth. It bears somewhat of the same relation to the authenticity of the Books of Moses, and the original genuineness of the revelation contained in them, that the language of the New Testament Scriptures, the peculiar type of the period to which it belonged, does in reference to the truths and statements contained in them. Though certain critics of more zeal than discretion, have thought it would

be a great achievement for the literature of the New Testament, if they could establish its claim to be ranked in point of purity with the best of the Greek classics, no individual of sound judgment will dispute, that if they had succeeded in this, the loss would have been immensely greater than the gain; that one most important proof for the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament record would have perished—that, namely, arising from the exact conformity of its language to the period of its origin, and to no other. So, it is no discredit to the religion of Moses, that its symbols can so generally be identified with those currently employed at the period when it arose, and the peculiar resemblance borne by some of them to the customs and usages of Egypt, is like a stamp of veritableness impressed upon its very structure, testifying of its having originated in the time and circumstances mentioned in the original record. Nor can we fail to see in this the marvellous wisdom of the divine working, in connexion with the history of the undertaking of Moses, that while he was to be commissioned to set up a symbolical religion among the Israelites, the reverse in all its great features of that prevalent in Egypt, he should yet have been thoroughly qualified by his original training to serve himself of whatever suitable materials were furnished by the land of his birth. These were in a sense a part of the spoils taken from the enemy, out of which the tabernacle of the wilderness was reared—though still all things there, from the greatest to the least, were made after the divine pattern shown to Moses in the Mount, and in the truths it symbolized, and the purposes for which it was erected, it stood, not the slimy product of the Nile, but the chaste and holy architecture of Heaven.

It is not certainly for the purpose of finding any confirmation, in a theological point of view, to the argument maintained in the preceding pages, but only to show the foundation in nature, or the scientific basis which it also has to rest upon, that we produce the following quotation from Muller. The quotation is farther valuable, as it exhibits the view of a profound thinker, and one who has made himself intimately conversant with the thoughts and customs of remote antiquity, in regard to the meaning treasured up in the symbols of ancient worship, and the aptitude of the people to understand them. It is possible, that in the work from which we give the extract, he carries his views to an extreme, as we certainly conceive he does, in often making too much of particular transactions, and also in making the instruction by myths and symbols, not only independent of, but in some sort inconsistent with, direct instruction in doctrine. The general soundness, however, of his view regarding the significance of those ancient forms of instruction, especially of symbol, there are few men of learning and judgment who will now be disposed to call in question. "That this connexion of the idea with the sign, when it took place, was natural and necessary to the ancient world; that it occurred involuntarily; and that the essence of the symbol consists in this supposed real

connexion of the sign with the thing signified, I here assume. Now, symbols in this sense are evidently coeval with the human race; they result from the union of the soul with the body in man; nature has implanted the feeling for them in the human heart. How is it that we understand what the endless diversities of human expression and gesture signify? How comes it, that every physiognomy expresses to us spiritual peculiarities, without any consciousness on our part of the cause? Here experience alone cannot be our guide; for without ever having seen a countenance like that of the Jupiter Olympus, we should yet, when we saw it, immediately understand its features. An earlier race of mankind, who lived still more in sensible impressions, must have had a still stronger feeling for them. It may be said that all nature wore to them a physiognomical aspect. Now, the worship which represented the feelings of the Divine in visible external actions, was in its nature thoroughly symbolical. No one can seriously doubt that prostration at prayer is a symbolic act; for corporeal abasement very evidently denotes spiritual subordination: so evidently, that language cannot even describe the spiritual, except by means of a material relation. But it is equally certain that sacrifice also is symbolical; for how would the feeling of acknowledgment, that it is a god (rather, God) who supplies us with food and drink, display itself in action, but by withdrawing a portion of them from the use of man, and setting it apart in honour of the Deity? But precisely because the symbolical has its essence in the idea of an actual connexion between the sign and the thing signified, was an inlet left for the superstitious error, that something palatable was really offered to the gods —that they tasted it. But it will scarcely do to derive the usage from this superstition; in other words, to assign the intention of raising a savoury steam as the original foundation of all sacrifice. It would then be necessary to suppose, that at the ceremony of libation the wine was poured on the earth, in order that the gods might lick it up! I have here only brought into view one side of the idea, which forms the basis of sacrifice, and which the other, certainly not less ancient, always accompanied, namely, the idea of atonement by sacrifice; which was from the earliest times expressed in numberless usages and legends, and which could only spring from the strongest and most intense religious feeling; "We are deserving of death; we offer as a substitute the blood of the animal."*—He states, a little further on, that we must not always presuppose, that a particular symbol corresponds exactly to a particular idea, such as we may be accustomed to conceive it; that the symbols will partly, indeed, remain the same as long as external nature continues unchanged, but that their signification will vary with the different national modes of intuition and other circumstances; so that a moral and religious economy, like that of Judaism, might be ingrafted on the nature-worship of Egypt—meaning, thereby, we suppose, that while many of the symbols were retained, a new and higher meaning was imparted to them.†

* Muller's Introd. to Scientific System of Mythology, p. 196, Trans. † Ib. 219, 222.

Having given the sentiments of one great authority, bearing on the external resemblance in some points between Judaism and the religions of heathen antiquity, we shall give the sentiments of another authority as to the radical difference in spirit and character which distinguished the true from the false, and whose low views on some vital points of doctrine only render his opinion here the less liable to suspicion. "Heathenism," says Baehr, "as is now no longer disputed, was in all its parts a nature-religion; that is, the deification of nature in its entire compass. That mode of contemplation, which was wont to perceive the ideal in the real, proceeded in heathenism a step farther; it saw in the world and nature, not merely a manifestation of Godhead, but the very essence and being of nature were regarded in it as identical with the essence and being of Godhead, and as such thrown together; the ultimate foundation of all heathenism is pantheism. Hence the idea of the oneness of the Divine Being was not absolutely lost, but this oneness was not at all that of a personal existence, possessing self-consciousness and self-determination, but an impersonal One, the great *It*, "a neuter abstract," the product of mere speculation, which is at once every thing and nothing. Wherever the Deity appeared as a person it ceased to be one, and resolved itself into an infinite multiplicity. But all these gods were mere personifications of the different powers of nature. From a religion which was so physical in its fundamental character, there could only be developed an ethics which would bear the hue and form of the physical. Above all that is moral rose natural necessity, fate, to which gods and men were alike subject; the highest moral aim for man was to yield an absolute submission to this necessity, and generally to transfuse himself into nature as being identified with Deity, to represent in himself its life, and especially that characteristic of it, perfect harmony, conformity to law and rule.—The Mosaic religion, on the other hand, has for its first principle the oneness and absolute spirituality of God. The Godhead is no neuter abstract, no It, but I; Jehovah is altogether a personal God. The whole world, with every thing it contains, is his work, the offspring of his own free act, his creation. Viewed as in and for itself this world is nothing; he alone *is*—absolute being. He is in it, indeed, but not as properly one with it; he is infinitely above it, and can clothe himself with it, as with a garment, or fold it up and lay it aside as he pleases. Now this God who reveals and manifests himself through all creation, in carrying into execution his purpose to save and bless all the families of the earth, revealed and manifested himself in an especial manner to one race and people. The centre of this revelation is the word which he spoke to Israel; but this word is his law, the expression of his perfect holy will. The essential character, therefore, of the special revelation of God is holiness. Its substance is, "Be ye holy, for I am holy." So that the Mosaic religion is throughout ethical; it always addresses itself to the will of man, and deals with him as a moral being. Every thing that God did for Israel, in the

manifestations he gave of himself, aims at this as its final end, that Israel should sanctify the name of Jehovah, and thereby himself be sanctified."*

CHAPTER II.

THE TABERNACLE IN ITS GENERAL STRUCTURE AND DESIGN.

By the establishment of the Sinaitic covenant the relation between God and Israel had been brought into a state of formal completeness. The covenant of promise, which pledged the divine faithfulness to bestow upon them every essential blessing, was now properly supplemented by the covenant of law, which took them bound to yield the dutiful return of obedience he justly expected from them. The foundation was thus outwardly laid for a near relationship subsisting, and a blessed intercourse developing itself between the God of Abraham, on the one hand, and the seed of Abraham on the other. And it was primarily with the design of securing and furthering this end, that the ratification of the covenant of Sinai was so immediately followed up by the adoption of measures for the erection of the tabernacle.

I. The command is first of all given for the children of Israel bringing the necessary materials; "and let them make me," it is added, "a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them," (Ex. xxv. 8.) The different parts are then minutely described, after which the general design is again indicated thus: "And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God; and they shall know that I am the Lord their God that brought them out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them; I am the Lord their God." (Ex. xxix. 45, 46.) With this representation of its general design the names or designations applied to it perfectly correspond.

(1.) Most commonly when a single name is used, it is that which answers to our word *dwelling* or *habitation*, (מִשְׁכָּן) although the word generally employed in our translation is *tabernacle*. Sometimes we find the more definite term *house*, (בַּיִת) the house of God, or the Lord's house, (Deut. xxiii. 18; Josh. ix. 23; Judg. xviii. 31,) or *tent*, (אֹהֶל Ex. xxvi. 11.) The dwelling in its original form was a tent, because the people among whom God came to reside and hold converse, were then dwelling in tents, and had not yet come to their settled habitation. But afterwards this tent was supplanted by the temple in Jerusalem, which bore the same relation to the ceiled houses in the land of Israel, that the original tabernacle held to the tents in the wilderness. And coming, as

* Symbolik, i. p. 35—37, where also confirmatory testimonies are produced from Creuzer, Görres, Hegel, Schlegel.

the temple thus did, in the room of the tabernacle, and holding the same relative position, it was sometimes spoken of as the *tent* of God, (Ex. xli. 1,) though more commonly it received the appellation of the *house* of God, or his *habitation*.

(2.) Besides these names, certain descriptive epithets were applied to the tabernacle. It was called the *tent of meeting*, (אהל מועד) for which our version has unhappily substituted the *tent of the congregation*. The expression is intended to designate this tent or dwelling as the place in which God was to meet and converse with his people; not, as is very often supposed, the place where the children of Israel were to assemble, and in which they had a common interest. It was this certainly; but merely because it was another and higher thing—because it formed for them all the one point of contact and channel of intercourse between Heaven and earth. This is clearly brought out in Ex. xxix. 42, 43, where the Lord himself gives an explanation of the "tabernacle of meeting," and says concerning it: "Where I will meet with you, to speak there unto thee; and there I will meet with the children of Israel, and it shall be sanctified by my glory."

(3.) The tabernacle is again described as the *tabernacle of testimony*, or *tent of witness*, (משכן העדות אהל העדות Numb. ix. 15, xvii. 7, xviii. 2.) It received this designation from the law of the two tables, which were placed in the ark or chest that stood in the innermost sanctuary. These tables were called "the testimony," (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 29,) and the ark which contained them, "the ark of testimony," (Ex. xxv. 21, 22;) whence also the whole tabernacle was called the tabernacle or tent of testimony. The witnessing, as noticed above, p. 84, had a twofold respect—to the holiness of God on the one hand, and to the sinfulness of the people on the other. While the tables expressed the righteous demands of the former, they necessarily bore a condemnatory testimony respecting the latter. So that the meeting which God's people were to have with him in his habitation, was not simply for receiving the knowledge of the divine will, or holding fellowship with God in general, but all with an especial respect to the sins on their part, against which the law was ever testifying, and the means of their restoration to his favour and blessing.

Viewing the tabernacle, then, (or the temple,) in this general aspect, we may state its immediate object and design to have been the bringing of God near to the Israelites in his true character, and keeping up an intercourse between him and them. It was intended to satisfy the desire so feelingly expressed by Job, "Oh that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat;" and to provide, by means of a local habitation, with its appropriate services, for the attainment of a livelier apprehension of God's character, and the maintenance of a closer and more assured fellowship with him. To some extent this end might have been reached without the intervention of such an apparatus; for in itself it is a spiritual thing; and properly consists in the exercise of suitable thoughts and affections toward God, meeting with

gracious manifestations of his love and blessing. But under a dispensation so imperfect as to the measure of light it imparted, the Israelites would certainly, without some outward and visible help, such as a worldly sanctuary, have either sunk into practical ignorance and forgetfulness of God, or betaken themselves to some wrong methods of bringing divine things more distinctly within the grasp and comprehension of their minds. It was thus that idol-worship arose, and was with such difficulty repressed in the chosen family itself. Till God was made manifest in flesh, in the person of Christ, even the pious mind anxiously sought to lay hold of some visible link of communion to connect it with Heaven. So Jacob, after he had seen the heavenly vision on the plains of Bethel, could not refrain from anointing the stone on which his head was laid, and calling it "the house of God." He felt as if that stone now possessed a connexion with Heaven peculiar to itself; and with a mind less enlightened, he would assuredly have converted it in the days of his future prosperity into an idol, and erected on the spot a fane where it might be enshrined and worshipped.

It was, therefore, with the view of meeting this natural tendency, or of assisting the natural weakness of men in dealing with divine and spiritual things, that God condescended to provide for himself a local habitation among his people. His doing so was an act of great kindness and grace to them; at the same time, it manifestly bespoke an imperfect state of things, and was merely an adaptation or expedient to meet the existing deficiencies of their religious condition, till a more perfect dispensation should come. Had they been able to look as with open eye on the realities of the heavenly world, they would have been raised above the necessity of any such external ladder to bring them into contact with its affairs; they would have found every place alike suitable for communing with God; and hence, when the intercourse between him and his redeemed offspring shall be brought to absolute perfection —when "the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he shall dwell with them," no temple shall any longer be seen, (Rev. xxi. 3, 22;) for the fleshly weakness which once required this, shall have finally disappeared; every where the presence of God will be realized, and direct communion with him maintained. But it was otherwise amid the dim shadows of the earthly inheritance. There a visible pattern of divine things was required to help out in men's minds the manifold imperfection of the spiritual idea; a habitation was needed for the indwelling of Godhead in its communications with sinful men, such as might be scanned and measured by the bodily eye, and by serving itself of which the spiritual eye might rise to the clear apprehension of the realities of an unseen, spiritual existence.

II. But that this material dwelling-place of God might be a safe guide and real assistance in promoting fellowship with Heaven—that it might convey only right impressions of divine things, and form a suitable channel of communication between God and man, it must evidently be throughout of God's, and not of man's de-

vising. He must exhibit to Moses the pattern of things in the heavens, after which it was in every particular to be constructed; and though it was to be a tabernacle built with men's hands, yet these, from Moses, who was charged with the faithful execution of the whole, to the artificers who were to be employed in the preparation of the materials, must all be guided by the Spirit of God, supplying "wisdom and understanding and knowledge" for the occasion. This plainly indicates the high importance which was attached in the mind of God, to the proper construction of this divine habitation, and what a plenitude of meaning was designed to be expressed by it. Yet here also there is a middle path, which is the right one; and it is possible in searching for the truths embodied in those patterns of heavenly things to err by excess as well as by defect. We are not to suppose that a separate and distinct meaning attaches to each part by itself, or to the distinctive qualities, perhaps, of the materials of which the several parts were composed. Due regard must be had to the connexion and order of the parts one with another—their combination so as to form one harmonious whole—the circumstances in which, and the purposes for which that whole was constructed. And it is no more than we might expect beforehand, that in this sacred structure, as in erections of an ordinary kind, some things may have been ordered as they were from convenience, others from necessity, others again from the general effect they were fitted to produce, rather than from any peculiar significance belonging to them. Such, we think, will appear to be the case in regard to the only two points we are called to consider in the present chapter—the materials of which the tabernacle was formed, and its general structure and appearance.

(I.) In regard to the materials, one thing is common to them all, that they were to be furnished by the people, and presented as an offering, most of them also as a free-will offering, to the Lord: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering; of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering." (Ex. xxv. 2.) That the materials were to be brought by the people as an offering, implied that the structure for which they were given was altogether of a sacred character, being made of things consecrated to the Lord; and that the offering should have been of a free-will description, implied that there was to be no constraint in any thing connected with it, that, as in the erection of the house, so in the carrying out of the purposes for which it was erected, there must be the ready concurrence of man's sanctified will with the grace and condescension of God. Other ideas have sometimes been sought in connexion with the source from which the materials were derived, but without any warrant from Scripture. For example, much has frequently been made of the circumstance, that these materials formed a portion of the spoils of Egypt; they may indeed have been so, and in all probability were, to a considerable extent at least; but the text is silent upon the subject, and at the time when the people were called upon

to give them, they were their own property, and simply as such (not as having been in any particular manner obtained) were the people called upon to give them. Again, a portion of the materials, the whole of the silver, it would seem, which was employed in the erection, was formed of the half-shekel of redemption-money, which Moses was ordered to levy from every male in the congregation; and as this was chiefly used in making the sockets of the sanctuary, special meanings have been derived from the circumstance. But, that nothing peculiar was designed to be intimated by that, is clear from the two considerations, that a part of this silver was applied to a quite different use, to the making of hooks and ornaments for the pillars, and that *all* the sockets were not made of it; for those of the door or entrance were formed of the free-will offerings of brass.

The materials themselves were of various sorts, according to the uses for which they were required: Precious stones, of several kinds; gold, silver, and brass; shittim-wood; linen or cotton fabrics of blue, purple, and scarlet, and skins for external coverings. Separate and distinct meanings have been found in each of these, derived either from their inherent qualities, or from their colours, and by none with so much learning and ingenuity as Baehr; but still without any solid foundation. That the wood, for example, should have been that of the shittah-tree, or the acacia, as it is now by general consent agreed to have been, had a sufficient reason in the circumstance, which Baehr himself admits,* that it is the tree chiefly found in that part of Arabia where the tabernacle was constructed, and the only one of such dimensions as to yield boards suitable for the purpose. It was not as if a choice lay between this and some other kinds of trees, and this in particular fixed upon on account of some inherent qualities peculiar to itself. Besides, in the temple, which for all essential purposes was one with the tabernacle, the wood employed was not the acacia, but the cedar, and that, no doubt, for the same reason as the other had been, being the best and most suitable for the purpose, which the region afforded. The lightness of the acacia wood, and its being less liable to corrupt than some other species,† were incidental advantages peculiarly fitting it for the use it was here applied to; but we have no reason to suppose that any thing further, or more recondite, depended on them. According to the just remark of Hengstenberg, in so far as things in the tabernacle differed from those in the temple, they must have been of an adventitious and external nature.‡

In regard to the other articles used, it does not appear, that any higher reason can be assigned for their selection, than that

* Symbolik, i. p. 262.

† That it was absolutely incorruptible, is not of course to be imagined, though the language of Josephus, Philo, and some heathen writers would seem to imply as much. It is called ξυλον ασηπτον by the LXX., and Josephus affirms it could not "suffer corruption." For other authorities, see in Baehr, i. p. 262. The simple truth seems to have been, that it was light and stood the water well, hence was much used by the Egyptians in making boats, and was loosely talked of as incorruptible.

‡ Authentie, ii. p. 639.

they were the best and fittest of their several kinds. They consisted of the most precious metals, of the finest stuffs in linen manufacture, with embroidered workmanship, the richest and most gorgeous colours, and the most beautiful and costly gems. It was absolutely necessary, by means of some external apparatus, to bring out the idea of the surpassing glory and magnificence of Jehovah as the king of Israel, and of the singular honour which was enjoyed by those who were admitted to minister and serve before him. But this could only be done by the rich and costly nature of the materials which were employed in the construction of the tabernacle, and of the official garments of those who were appointed to serve in its courts. It is expressly said of the high-priest's garments, that they were to be made "for glory (or ornament) and for beauty," (Ex. xxviii. 2;) for which purpose they were to consist of the fine byss or linen cloth of Egypt (Gen. xli. 42; Luke xvi. 19,) embroidered with needle-work done in blue, purple, and scarlet, the most brilliant colours. And if means were thus taken for producing effect in respect to the garments of those who ministered in the tabernacle, it is but reasonable to infer that the same would be done in regard to the tabernacle itself. Hence, we read of the temple, the more perfect form of the habitation, that it was to be made "so exceeding magnifical as to be of fame and glory throughout all countries," (1 Chron. xxii. 5,) and that among other things employed by Solomon for this purpose, "the house was garnished with precious stones for beauty," (2 Chron. iii. 6.) Such materials, therefore, were used in the construction of the tabernacle, as were best fitted for conveying suitable impressions of the greatness and glory of the Being for whose peculiar habitation it was erected. And as in this we are furnished with a sufficient reason for their employment, to search for others were only to wander into the regions of uncertainty and conjecture.*

* We therefore discard, with Hengstenberg, Baumgarten, and others, the meanings derived by Baehr, as well as those of the older theologians, from the intrinsic qualities of the metals, and the distinctive colours employed in the several fabrics, as out of place here. The question is not, whether such things *might* not have been used, so as to convey certain ideas of a moral and religious nature, but whether they actually were so employed here—and neither the occasion of their employment, nor the manner in which this was done, in our opinion, gives the least warrant for the supposition. So far as the metals were concerned, we see no ground in Scripture for *any* symbolical meaning being attached to them, separate from that suggested by their costliness and ordinary uses. A symbolical use of certain colours, we undoubtedly find, such as of white, in expressing the idea of purity, or of red, in expressing that of guilt; but when so used, the particular colour must be rendered prominent, and connected also with an occasion plainly calling for such a symbol. This was not the case in either respect with the colours in the tabernacle. The colours there, for the most part, appeared in a combined form—and, if it had been possible to single them out, and give to each a distinctive value, there was nothing to indicate how the ideas symbolized were to be viewed, whether in reference to God, or to his worshippers. Indeed, the very search would necessarily have led to endless subtleness, and prevented the mind from receiving the one direct and palpable impression, which we have seen was intended to be conveyed. (As examples of the arbitrariness necessarily connected with such meanings, Baehr makes the scarlet in the tabernacle symbolical of the life-giving property of God, while Sol. van Til had with equal reason descried in it a sign of the blood of the martyrs; and the gold with which so many articles were overlaid, is taken by Baehr to be the symbol of

(2.) Looking now to the general structure and appearance of the tabernacle, we might certainly expect the following characteristics: that being a tent, or moveable habitation, it would be constructed in such a manner, as to present somewhat of the general aspect of such tenements, and be adapted for removals from place to place; and that being the tent of God, it would be fashioned within and without, so as to manifest the peculiar sacredness and grandeur of its destination. This is precisely what we find to have been the case. Like tents generally, it was longer than broad, thirty cubits long by ten broad; and while on three of the sides possessing wooden walls, yet these were composed of separate gilded boards, rising perpendicularly from silver sockets, kept together by means of golden rings through which transverse bars were passed, and hence easily taken asunder when a removal was made. So also the larger articles of furniture belonging to the tabernacle, the ark, the table, and the altars of incense and burnt-offering, were each furnished with rings and staves, for the greater facility of transportation. But neither within nor without must the wooden walls be seen, otherwise the appearance of a tent would not be preserved. Hence a series of coverings was provided; the innermost of which was formed of fine linen—ten breadths, five of which were joined together to make each one curtain, and the two curtains were again united together by means of fifty loops. This innermost covering was not thrown over the boards of the tabernacle, so as to hang down outside, but was suspended within, by means of hooks and eyes, so that the whole interior of the sides, as well as the roof, was covered by it. Internally, it might be regarded as the tabernacle itself; and indeed is so named in Ex. xxvi. 6, where, after describing how the several curtains were to be coupled together, it is added respecting the whole, "and it shall be one tabernacle."* Then, above this, and forming an outer co-

the splendour and majesty of God's holiness, while in this country typologists have considered it as representing the divine nature of Christ, giving infinite perfection to his holiness and services. In such cases, it is impossible to distinguish between one opinion and another, as there is no solid ground for any of them to stand upon.)

The total value of the materials used in the construction of the tabernacle must have been very great. Estimated according to the present commercial value, the twenty-nine talents of gold alone would be equal to about £173,000; and Dr. Kitto's aggregate sum of £250,000, might probably come near the mark of the entire cost. But there can be no doubt, that the precious metal and stones were much more common, consequently of much less comparative value in remote antiquity than they are now. In some of the ancient temples, as well as treasure houses of kings, we read on good authority of almost incredible stores of them. For example, in the temple of Belus at Babylon, there was a single statue of Belus, with a throne and table, weighing together 800 talents of gold; and in the temple altogether about 7170 talents. Still, even this was greatly outdone by the amount of treasure which, on the most moderate calculation, we have reason to think was expended on the temple at Jerusalem. In such vast expenditure, whether on the tabernacle or the temple, it is not necessary to think of any accommodation to heathen prejudices, nor of any thing but an intention to represent symbolically the greatness and glory of the divine Inhabitant.

* Baehr's Symbolik, i. p. 222, 223. The usual descriptions respecting these coverings (not excepting Dr. Kitto's) representing them all as thrown over the boards simply for protection, are by no means correct.

vering, reaching to the foot of the boards outside, was a cloth made of goat's hair—which, to the present day, is the usual external covering of the Arabian tents. As this gave to the sacred tabernacle externally the appearance of a tent, it is also, as well as the internal tapestry, designated as the tabernacle itself, (Ex. xxvi. 11.) And above both of these curtains, a double coating of skins was thrown, evidently for protection—the first consisting of ram's skins dyed red, the other and outermost, of what, in our version, are called badger's skins, but which are now commonly understood to have been some kind of deer-skin, or perhaps seal-skin, peculiarly adapted for withstanding the atmospheric influences.

These parts and properties, or things somewhat similar, were essential to the sacred erection as a tent; it could not have preserved its tent-like appearance without them, and been adapted for moving from place to place. Therefore, to seek for some deeper and spiritual reasons for such things as the boards and bars, the rings and staves, the different sorts of coverings, the loops and the taches, &c., is to go entirely into the region of conjecture, and give unbounded scope to the exercise of fancy. A plain and palpable reason existed for them in the very nature and design of the erection; and why should this not suffice? Or, if license be granted for the introduction of other reasons, who shall determine, since all must alike swim in the air, which ought to be preferred? It is enough to account for the things referred to, that as God's house was made in the fashion of a tent, these, or others somewhat similar, were absolutely necessary; they as properly belonged to it in that character, as the members of our Lord's body and the garments he wore belonged to his humanity; and it is as much beside the purpose to search for an independent and separate instruction in the one, as for an independent and separate use in the other. Hence, when the house of God exchanged the tent for the temple form, it dropt the parts and properties in question, as being no longer necessary or suitable; which alone was sufficient to prove them to have been only outward and incidental.

But other things, again, were necessary, on account of the tabernacle being, not simply a tent, but the tent of the Most High God, for purposes of fellowship between him and his people: such as, the ornamental work on the tapestry, the division of the tabernacle into more than one apartment, and the encompassing of it with a fore-court, by means of an enclosure of fine linen, which in a manner proclaimed to the approaching worshippers, *Procul profani!* That the apartments should have consisted of no more than an outer and inner sanctuary; or that the figures wrought into the tapestry should have been precisely those of the cherubim, in these we may well feel ourselves justified in searching for some more special instruction; for they might obviously have been ordered otherwise, and were doubtless ordered thus for important purposes. On which account, both characteristics re-appear in the temple, as being of essential and abiding significance. But considered merely in a general point of view, the embroidery, the separate apartments,

and the surrounding enclosure, may all be regarded as having the reason of their appointment in the sacred character of the tabernacle itself, and the high ends for which it was erected. Such things became it as the tent which God took for his habitation.

III. This habitation of God, whether existing in the form of a tent, or of a temple, was at once the holiest and the greatest thing in Israel; and therefore required, not only to be constructed of such materials and in such a manner as now described, but also to be set apart by a special act of consecration. For it was the seat and symbol of the divine kingdom on earth. The *one* seat and symbol; because Jehovah, the God of Israel, being the one living God, and, though filling heaven and earth with his presence, yet condescending to exhibit, in an outward, material form, the things concerning his character and glory, behooved to take especial precaution against the idea, so apt to intrude from other quarters, of a divided personality. This he could effectually do no otherwise, than by presenting himself to his people as so essentially and absolutely one, that he could have but one proper habitation, and one throne of government. Here alone must they come to transact with God in the things that concerned their covenant relation to him. To present elsewhere the sacrifices and services, which became his house, was a violation of the order and solemnities of his kingdom;* while, on the other hand, to have free access to this chosen residence of Deity, was justly prized by the wise among the people, as their highest privilege. Exclusion from this was like banishment from God's presence, and excision from his covenant. And pious Israelites, like the Psalmist, ever counted it among the most dark and trying dispensations of Providence, when events occurred to compel their separation from this appointed channel of communion with the Highest.

Still, enlightened worshippers understood, that the enjoyment of God's presence and blessing was by no means confined to that outward habitation, and that while it was the *seat*, it was also the *symbol* of the kingdom of God. They perceived in it the image of his character and administration in general, and understood that the relations there unfolded were proper to the whole Church of God. Hence, the Psalmist represents it as the common privilege of an Israelite to dwell in the house of God, and abide in his tabernacle, (Ps. xv., xxiv.) though in the literal sense not even the priests could be said to do so. Of himself he speaks as desiring to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of his life (Ps. xxvii.) by which he could only mean, that he earnestly wished continually to realize and abide in that connexion and fellowship with God, which he saw so clearly symbolized in the form and services of the

* Hence, sacrificing in the high places, though occasionally done by true worshippers, always appears as an imperfection. In times of war, or great internal disorder, such as those of Samuel, when the ark was separated from the tabernacle, and the stated ordinances suffered a kind of suspension, sacrifices in different places became necessary.

tabernacle. And, indeed, this symbolical import of the tabernacle was plainly indicated by the Lord himself to Moses, in the words, "And I will set my tabernacle among you, and I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people," (Lev. xxvi. 11, 12.) The least in spiritual discernment could scarcely fail to learn here, that what was outwardly exhibited in the tabernacle, of God's nearness and familiarity with his people, was designed to be the image of what should always and every where be realizing itself among his people; that the tabernacle, in short, was just the symbol of the church.

Now, to fit it for this high destination and use, a special act of consecration was necessary. It was not enough that the materials of which it was built were all costly, and sacred as well as costly, having been presented as the people's offering to the Lord; nor that the pattern, after which the whole was constructed, was furnished immediately by the hand of God. After it had been thus constructed, and before it could be used as the Lord's tabernacle, it had to be consecrated by the application to all its parts and furniture of the holy anointing oil, which Moses was particularly instructed how to prepare (Ex. xxx. 22, ss.*) "And thou shalt sanctify them," was the word to Moses regarding this anointing oil, "that they may be most holy; whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy."

Old Testament scripture itself provides us with abundant materials for explaining the import of this action. It expressly connects this with the communication of the Spirit of God; as in the history of Saul's consecration to the kingly office, to whom Samuel said, after having poured the vial of oil upon his head, "And the Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee," (1 Sam. x. 6.) And still more explicitly in the case of David is the sign coupled with the thing signified, "Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward—but the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul," (xvi. 13, 14.) The gift, symbolized by the anointing, having been conferred upon the one, it was necessarily withdrawn from the other. But the connexion between the outward rite and the inward gift is most distinctly marked in the prophecy of Isaiah, lxi. 1, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, *because* he hath anointed me to preach good tidings," &c.

This passage may fitly be regarded as the connecting link between the Old and the New Testament usage in the matter. It designated the Saviour as *the Christ*, the one specially and preeminently anointed, and that with the Spirit of the Lord, for the execution of his great and blessed work. The symbolical rite in his case is omitted, as no longer needed, and the direct spiritual action proceeds by itself, the Spirit being given to abide with him in all his fulness. He was hence said by Peter to have been "anointed with

* It consisted of olive oil, mixed with the four best kind of spices, myrrh, sweet cinnamon, calamus, and cassia, producing, when compounded together, the most fragrant smell.

the Holy Ghost and with power." (Acts x. 38.) And because believers are spiritually united to Christ, and what he has without measure, is also in a measure theirs, they too are "anointed by God," or "have the unction (χρισμα) of the Holy One, which teacheth them all things," (2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 20.) Even under the dispensation of the New Testament, in regard to its earlier and more outward, its miraculous operations, we find the external symbol still retained: The apostle anointed many sick persons with oil and made them whole in the name of the Lord, (Mark vi. 13,) and James even couples this anointing with prayer as means proper to be employed by the elders of the church for drawing down the healing power of God (v. 14.) But the external rite could now only be regarded as appropriate in such operations of the Spirit as those referred to, where the natural and symbolical use of oil ran, in a manner, into each other.*

This sacred use of oil, however foreign to our apprehensions, grew quite naturally out of its common use in the East, especially in Egypt, Arabia, and Palestine. There, it has from the earliest times been regarded as singularly conducive to bodily health and vigour, and the heat of the climate may actually render it so. Even in Greece, where the heat is less enervating, the bodies of the combatants in the public games, it is well known, were always copiously rubbed and suppled with oil. And when mixed with perfumes, as the oil appears generally to have been, the copious application of it to the body may, partly from usage, and partly also from physical causes, have produced the most agreeable and invigorating sensations. So much, indeed, was this the case, especially in respect to the head, that the Psalmist even mentions his "anointing with oil" among the tokens of kindness he had received from the hand of God; and in entertainments, it was so customary to administer this species of refreshments to the guests, that our Lord charges the omission of it by Simon the Pharisee as an evident mark of disrespect (Luke vii. 46,) and in ancient Egypt "it was customary for a servant to attend every guest as he seated himself, and to anoint his head."†

As the body, therefore, which was anointed with such oil, felt itself enlivened and refreshed, and became expert and agile for the performance of any active labour, it was an apt and becoming symbol of the Spirit-replenished soul, which is thus endowed with such a plenitude of grace, as disposes and enables it to engage heartily in the divine service, and to run the way of God's commandments. So that in the language of Vitringa, "the anointed man was he,

* We cannot think that oil should have been used in such cases merely as "a salutary and approved medicament," (Bib. Cyclop. Art. Anointing,) as if the miraculous agency of the Spirit needed such external aid. But neither is it necessary to regard the action, with Hengstenberg, Christol. on Dan. ix. 24, as purely symbolical. The use of oil in sickness as a kind of outward cordial and refreshment, or even a sort of healing ointment, is frequently referred to in Scripture (Isa. i. 6; Luke x. 34,) and as the operation of the Spirit was here itself outward, the outward action at once as a symbol and a natural ointment, might fitly be employed.

† Wilkinson, Manners, &c. of Eg. iv. 279.

who being chosen and set apart by God for accomplishing something connected with God's glory, was furnished for it by his good hand with necessary gifts. And the more noble the office to which any one was anointed, the greater was the supply of the Spirit's grace which the anointing brought him."* Understood thus in reference to persons, to whom the outward symbol was both most naturally and most commonly applied, we can have no difficulty in apprehending its import, when applied to the tabernacle and its furniture. This being a symbol of the true Church as the peculiarly consecrated, God-inhabited region, the anointing of it with the sacred oil was a sensible representation of the effusion upon all there of the Holy Spirit, whose part it is to sanctify the unclean, and draw them within the sphere of God's inhabitation, as well as to fit them for occupying it. And as the anointing not only rendered the tabernacle and its vessels holy, but made them also the imparters of holiness to others—"whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy"—the important lesson was thereby taught, that, while all beyond is a region of pollution and death, they who really come into a living connexion with the church or kingdom of God, are brought into communion with his spiritual nature, are made partakers of his holiness. It is within the church that all purification and righteousness proceeds.†

IV. In turning now to gospel times for the spiritual and heavenly things, which answer to the pattern exhibited in that worldly sanctuary, we are not, of course, to think of outward and material buildings, which, however necessary for the due celebration of divine worship, must occupy an entirely different place from that anciently possessed by the Jewish tabernacle or temple. What is true of the divine kingdom generally, must especially hold in respect to the heart and centre of its administration; viz., that every thing about it rose, when the antitypes appeared, to a higher and more elevated stage; and that the ideas which were formerly symbolized by means of carnal and temporary things, are now seen embodied in great and abiding realities. Of what, then, was the tabernacle a type? Plainly of Christ, as God manifest in the flesh, and re-

* Com. in Isa. Vol. ii. p. 494, comp. also i. p. 289.

† In connecting the spiritual with the natural use of this symbol, Baehr does not appear to us to be happy. He throws together the two properties of oil, its capacity for giving light, and for imparting vigour and refreshment; and holds the anointing symbolical of the Spirit's gift, as the source of spiritual light and life in general—or rather, (for he evidently does not hold the personality of the Spirit,) as symbolical of the principle of light and life, or, in one word, of the holiness which was derived from the knowledge of God's law, (ii. p. 173.) But to say nothing of the doctrinal errors here involved, why should those two quite distinct properties of oil be confounded together? The qualities and uses of oil as an ointment, had nothing to do with those which belong to it as a source of light, and should no more be conjoined symbolically, than they are naturally. Oil as an ointment does not give light, and it is of no moment whether it were capable of doing so or not. When used as an ointment, it was also usually mixed with spices, which still more took off men's thoughts from its light-giving property, and especially was this the case in regard to its symbolical application in the tabernacle.—When oil began to be applied symbolically for consecrating any thing, is unknown. It was so used by Jacob on the plains of Bethel, and there is undoubted proof of its having been used in consecrating kings and priests in Egypt.—(Wilkinson, v. 279, ss.)

conciling flesh to God; for this is Heaven's grand and permanent provision for securing what the tabernacle as a temporary substitute aimed at accomplishing—the indwelling of God with his people, and the maintaining of a holy fellowship between them. In Christ personally the idea was in the first instance visibly realized, when, as the divine Word, "he became flesh, and dwelt (εσκηνωσεν, tabernacled) among us." For the flesh of Jesus, though literally flesh of our flesh, yet being sanctified in the womb of the virgin by the power of the Holy Ghost, possessed in it "the whole fulness of the Godhead bodily," (σωματικως, in a bodily receptacle or habitation;) and held such pre-eminence over other flesh, as the tent of God had formerly done over the tents of Israel. But this was still merely the first stage in the development of the great mystery of godliness; only as in the seed-corn was the indwelling of God with men seen in the person of the incarnate Word. For Christ's flesh was the representative and root of all flesh as redeemed; in him the whole of an elect humanity stands as its living Head, and there alone finds the bond of its connexion with God, the channel of a real and blessed fellowship with Heaven. So that as the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ, he again dwells in the church of true believers as his fulness; and the idea symbolized in the tabernacle is properly realized, not in Christ personally and apart, but in him as the head of a redeemed offspring, vitally connected with him and through him with God. Consequently the idea, as to its realization, is still in progress; and it shall have reached its perfect consummation only when the number of the redeemed has been made up, and all are set down with Jesus amid the light and glories of the New Jerusalem.

Every reader of New Testament Scripture is aware how prominently the truths involved in this representation are brought out there, and how much the language it employs of divine things bears respect to them. The transition from the outward and shadowy to the final and abiding state of things, is first marked by our Lord in the words, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," (John ii. 19,) by which he plainly wished it to be understood, that his body had now become, what the temple had hitherto been; or rather, that the great idea symbolized in the temple was now realized in his person, in which really and properly Godhead had taken up its dwelling, that men might draw near and have fellowship with it. As there could be but one such place and medium of intercourse, Christ's saying this of his body, of necessity implied, that the outward temple, built with men's hands, had served its purpose, and was among the things ready to vanish away. But the peculiar expression he uses implies something more than this. For when he speaks of the destroying of the temple, and the raising of it up again in three days, he so identified his body with the temple, as in a manner to declare that the destruction of the one would carry along with it the destruction of the other; that *that* henceforth would be alone the proper dwelling-place of Deity, which he had made instinct with the principle of an immortal life, and would

therefore raise up again to be the perpetual seat and centre of God's kingdom; and that the other should consequently have lost its significancy and use, and should now be "left desolate," the great inhabitant being gone.

But this inhabitation of God in the man Christ Jesus, being not for himself alone, but only as the medium of intercourse and communion between God and the church, we find the idea extended so as to embrace both each individual believer, and the entire company of believers as one body. The church is "the house of God," or "his habitation through the Spirit," (1 Tim. iii. 15; Eph. ii. 22, 23;) and as the church universal of believers, is only an aggregate of individual believers, who must each be in part what the whole is, so they also are designated "a building of God," and more specially "the temple of the living God," or, as St. Peter describes them "lively stones built up on Christ the living stone, into a spiritual house," (1 Cor. iii. 9, vi. 19; Eph. iii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 5, 6.) In this apparent complexity of meaning, there is still a radical oneness; and it is by no means as if the tabernacle or temple-idea were applied to so many objects properly distinct and apart. There is an essential unity in the diversity, arising from the vital connexion subsisting between Christ and his people; for all redeemed humanity is linked with his, as his is linked with the Godhead, so that what belongs to the one is the common property and distinction of the whole. According to the sublime words of Christ himself, which just describe the ultimate realization of what was typified in the temple, "And the glory, which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." (John xvii. 22, 23.)

And as every thing in the original tabernacle required to be sprinkled with the holy anointing oil, to fit it for its sacred destination and use, so in these higher and ultimate realities of the divine kingdom, all is pervaded and consecrated by the living Spirit of God. It is as connected with his working, that humanity in Jesus becomes the fit dwelling-place of Deity. It is as replenished with his fulness, that Jesus accomplished, in his own person, the work of reconciliation, and placed on a secure foundation the intercommunion between God and man. It is, again, as having received from the Father the promise of the Spirit, and shedding forth his regenerating grace through the divine kingdom, that it becomes a hallowed region, consecrating whatever really comes within its borders, and that every one, whom a living faith brings into contact with Christ, is made partaker of his holiness. So also from the divine head downwards to the very skirt of his garments. The ordinances of the church are sources of life and blessing, only in so far as they are the instruments and channels of the Spirit's working. He, who through baptism has become savingly united to the one spiritual body, must have been baptized into it by the one Spirit, (1 Cor. xii. 13.) He, who through the word of the

gospel has been convinced of sin, righteousness and judgment, and received of the things of Christ, has found them thus powerful, because accompanied with the inward grace of the Spirit, (John xvi. 8, 14.) Merely as endowed with the Spirit is the believer constituted a temple of God, (1 Cor. vi. 19,) and only as being wrought in him by the same Spirit, do the works which proceed from his hand possess the essential element of righteousness, and attain to a place and a memorial in the kingdom of God. In short, it is the Spirit, by which all in this kingdom is sanctified and cemented in holy union with the Godhead.*

In the preceding chapter we have made no allusion to the views of other writers respecting the tabernacle, but have simply unfolded what we conceive to be the true idea of it, and its relation to Christ and his kingdom. It may be proper, however, to give here a brief outline of other views, with a few remarks indicating what seems erroneous or defective in them.

1. By Philo, the tabernacle was taken for a pattern of the universe: to the two sanctuaries belonged τα νοη τα, and to the open fore-court τα αισθητα; the linen, blue, purple, and scarlet, were the four elements; the seven-branched candlestick represented the seven planets, the light in the centre, however, at the same time representing the sun; the table, with the twelve loaves, pointed to the twelve zodiacs and months of the year, &c. Josephus adopts the same view, only differing in some of the details; as do also many of the fathers, in particular Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. Several of the Jewish Rabbis also concur in regarding the erection as an image of the creation in heaven and on earth, references to whom, as well as the others, are given by Baehr, i. p. 104, 105. He justly objects to this view, however, that it places the symbols of the Mosaic religion substantially on a footing with those of heathenism: both alike would have been employed in the service of a mere nature-worship. Not only would the peculiar ideas and principles of the true religion have been excluded from the one sanctuary and centre of all its services, but religious symbols of a precisely opposite kind have occupied their place. This was plainly impossible.

2. But Baehr's own view so far coincides with the one just mentioned, that he also holds the tabernacle to have been a representation of the creation of God, which, he endeavours to show, is fre-

* The supplanting of the Old Testament temple by this new consecration through the Spirit of something unspeakably better and higher, is referred to in that part of Daniel's prophecy which makes mention of "anointing the most holy," (ix. 24,) or as Dathe, Stonard, and especially Hengstenberg have clearly shown, it should rather be, "anointing a holy of holies," that is, a new temple for the Lord, the church of the New Covenant, consisting of Christ and all his spiritual members. In the coming and better state of things, not one part merely, but the whole should be a holy of holies; and while this was being done, the old fabric should be made desolate because of the overspreading of abominations in it (v. 26.) Instead of being a holy thing, sanctifying all that touched it, it should have become a seat of pollution; and not only must be dispensed with, as no longer needed on account of the new dwelling-place provided, but must even be swept away as an abomination from the earth.

quently exhibited in Scripture as the house or building of God; not however in the heathen sense—not as if the Deity and creation were identified, but in the sense of creation being the workmanship and manifestation of God—the outgoing and witness of his glorious perfections. In like manner, the tabernacle was the place and structure, through which God gave to Israel a testimony or manifestation of himself; and, therefore, it must contain in miniature a representation of the universe—the habitation, in its two compartments, representing heaven, God's peculiar dwelling-place, and the fore-court the earth, which he has given to the sons of men.

It may be regarded as alone fatal to this view, that amid the many allusions in Scripture to the tabernacle, and express explanations of the things belonging to it, the view in question is never once distinctly brought out. And as a great deal is found in direct confirmation of the view exhibited in our pages, we are well entitled to consider it as implying a substantial repudiation of the other. No doubt heaven and earth are often represented in Scripture as a building of God; but, as Hengstenberg justly remarks,* "There is not to be found in all Scripture a single passage in which the universe is described as *the* building or dwelling-place of God; so that the view of Baehr fails in its very foundation." He further remarks, that it provides no proper ground for explaining the separation between the Holy and the most Holy place, and that Baehr has hence been obliged to put a false interpretation upon the furniture belonging to the Holy place. As for the confirmation which the learned author seeks for the basis of his view, in the opinion of Philo and Josephus, as if that were the originally Jewish mode of contemplating the tabernacle, no one unbiassed by theory can regard it in any other light than as the fruit of that anxiety, which these writers constantly display, to bring the Jewish Scriptures and religion into some degree of conformity with the heathen philosophy.

3. The work of Baehr has called forth a laboured defence of another view, equally unsupported in Scripture, and still more arbitrary—according to which the tabernacle was made in imitation of man, as the image of God. This view had been briefly indicated by Luther, not as a formal explanation of the proper design and purpose of the tabernacle, but rather by way of illustration and similitude, when expounding the words of Mary's song: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit rejoiceth in God my Saviour." There, after mentioning the different divisions of the tabernacle, he says, "In this figure there is represented a Christian man; his spirit is the Holy of holies, God's dwelling, in dark faith without light; for he believes what he sees not. His soul is the Holy place, where are the seven lights, that is, all sorts of understanding, discernment, knowledge, and perception of corporeal and visible things. His body is the fore-court which is open to all, so that every one can see what it does, and how it lives." Baehr had

* Authentie, ii. p. 639.

justly said of this, that it was only an allegorical explanation, and intimated that he conceived it impossible to carry out such a view into the particulars. But a zealous Lutheran, Ferdinand Frederick, offended at the slight thus put upon "the words of the blessed Luther," has undertaken a vindication of the view, in a volume of considerable size, and accompanied by twenty-three plates. The work contains some good remarks on the more objectionable parts of Baehr's system, yet adopts a number of its errors, displays throughout, indeed, the want of a sound discrimination, and utterly fails to establish the main point at issue. The objections given above to Baehr's view apply with increased force to this.

4. The view of what are distinctively called the typical writers, errs primarily and fundamentally in considering the tabernacle as too exclusively typical, in seeking for the adumbration of Christ and his salvation as the only reason of the things belonging to it. Hence no proper ground or basis was laid for the work of interpretation, and unless where Scripture itself had furnished the explanation, the most arbitrary and even puerile meanings were often resorted to, without the possibility of applying, on that system, any check to them. Not keeping in view the great idea or design of the tabernacle, every thing for the most part was understood personally of Christ; and even where a measure of discretion was observed in abstaining from too great minutiæ, and keeping in view the larger features of the Christian system, as in Witsius' (Miscellanea Sacra,) still it all swims in a kind of uncertainty, because no care was taken to investigate the meaning of the symbols before they were interpreted as types.

5. The only remaining view requiring a separate notice is what is commonly regarded as the Spencerian, although Spencer did not originate it, but found its leading principles already laid down by Maimonides.* It proceeds on the ground of an accommodation in the grossest sense to the heathen-inclined tendencies and dispositions of the people. The Egyptians and other nations had dwellings for their gods; it was not convenient or practicable at once to abolish the custom; and God must, therefore, to prevent his people from lapsing into heathenism, suit himself to this state of things, have a tabernacle for his dwelling, with its appropriate furniture and ministering servants. We have already, in the introductory chapter, substantially met this view; as it rests upon

* He is substantially followed by many of the later Rabbis, who represent the tabernacle and temple as constructed with the view of imitating, and, at the same time outdoing, the palaces of earthly monarchs. Various quotations may be seen in Outram. That from R. Shem Tob is the most distinct and graphic, and is made of especial account by Spencer: "God, to whom be praise, commanded a house to be built for himself, such as a royal house is wont to be. In a royal house all these things are to be found, of which we have spoken: namely, there are some to guard the palace: others, whose part it is to do things belonging to the royal dignity, to prepare banquets, and do other things necessary for the monarch. There are others besides, who serve with vocal and instrumental music. There is a place also for making ready victuals; a place for burning perfumes; a table also for the king, and an apartment appropriated to himself, where none are permitted to enter, excepting his prime minister, and those who are specially favoured by him. In like manner God," &c.

the same false principles which pervade the whole system of Spencer. According to it God accommodates himself, not merely to what is weak and imperfect in his creatures, but to what is positively wrong; and lowers and adjusts his requirements to suit their depraved tastes and inclinations. Consequently the views of God, which such a structure was fitted to impart, and the services connected with it, must have been quite opposed to the spiritual nature of God, and an obstruction, rather than a help, to pious Israelites in their endeavours to worship and serve God aright. It was not a temporary and fitting expedient to aid men's conceptions of divine things, and to render the divine service more intelligible and attractive; but a sop put into the mouth of a rude and heathenish people, to keep them away from the grosser pollutions of idolatry. God's house could never be built on such a foundation.—Some of the older typical writers, such as Outram (De Sac. L. i. 3,) trod too closely upon this view of the tabernacle, as regards its primary intention for Israel, and so also, we regret to say, does Dr. Kitto of recent writers (Hist. of Palestine, i. 245, 6.)

CHAPTER III.

THE MINISTERS OF THE TABERNACLE—THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

THE general divisions of the tabernacle, and even its particular parts and services, were so peculiarly connected with the persons who were appointed to tread its courts, that it is necessary, before proceeding farther, to understand distinctly the place which these held in the Mosaic dispensation, and especially, how they stood related to God, on the one hand, and to the people on the other. This chapter must therefore be devoted to the consideration of the Levitical priesthood.

I. It is somewhat singular, that the first notices we have of a priesthood in Scripture, refer to other branches of the human family than that of the line of Abraham. The first person, with whom the name of *priest* is there associated, is Melchizedec, who is described as "king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God." To him Abraham, though the head of the whole chosen family, paid tithes of all, and by the act substantially confessed himself to be no priest, in the sense in which Melchizedec was. Then, in the days of Joseph, we meet with Potipherah, priest of On, or Heliopolis in Egypt, and of the priests generally, as a distinct and highly privileged order in that country (Gen. xli. 45; xlvii. 22;) and a few generations later still, mention is made of Jethro, the priest of Midian. Not till the children of Israel left the land of Egypt, and were placed under that peculiar polity which was set up among them by the hand of Moses, do we hear of any individual, or class

of individuals, holding the office of the priesthood as a distinct and exclusive prerogative. How, then, did they make their approach to God and present their obligations? Did each worshipper transact for himself with God? Or, did the father of a family act as priest for the members of his household? Or, was the priestly function among the privileges of the first-born? This last position has been maintained by many of the leading Jewish authorities, (Jonathan, Onkelos, Saadias, Jarchi, Abenezra, &c.) and also by some men of great learning in Christian times, (Grotius, Selden, Bochart, &c.) They have chiefly grounded their opinion on the circumstance of Moses having employed certain young men to offer the sacrifices, by the blood of which the covenant was ratified (Ex. xxiv. 5,) connecting this fact, on the one hand, with the profaneness of Esau in having despised his birth-right, which is thought to have been a slighting of the priesthood, and, on the other, with God's special consecration of the first-born, after the preservation of the first-born in Egypt. This opinion, however, may now be regarded as almost universally abandoned. The consecration of the first-born on the eve of Israel's departure from Egypt, did not, as we shall see, include their appointment to the priestly office; nor was this reckoned among the rights of primogeniture. These rights Scripture itself has plainly indicated to have been confined to pre-eminence in authority among the brethren, and the possession of a double portion in the inheritance (1 Chron. v. 1, 4.) And it would appear, from the scattered notices of patriarchal history, that there was no absolute restriction in remote antiquity to prevent any person from drawing near and presenting obligations to God, who might feel himself called by a suitable occasion to do so. So long, however, as the patriarchal constitution prevailed, it was by common consent felt due to the head of the family, as the highest in honour, and the proper representative of the whole, that he should deal with God in their behalf by the presentation of sacrifice. By degrees, as families grew into communities, and the patriarchal became merged in more general and public authorities, the sacerdotal office also naturally came to be vested, at least on all great and special occasions, in the persons of those who occupied the rank of heads in their respective communities, or of others, who, being regarded as peculiarly qualified for exercising the priestly function, were expressly chosen and delegated to discharge it. So in particular with the chosen family. In earlier times each patriarch did the work of a sacrificer; but when they had become a numerous people, and were going *as* a people to offer sacrifice to God, while they were primarily represented by Moses, whom God had raised up for their head, and who, therefore, alone properly did the part of a priest at the ratification of the covenant, by sprinkling the blood, they appear, as was natural, to have appointed certain of their number, pre-eminent in rank, in comeliness of person, or qualities of mind, to assist in priestly offices. These, no doubt, were the persons from whom Moses selected a few to furnish him with the blood of sprinkling on the occasion referred

to, and who had previously been spoken of as a body under the name of priests (Ex. xix. 22.)*

Indeed, so far from wondering that there was no distinct class invested with the office of priesthood during the patriarchal period

* Vitringa, Obs. Sac. I. De prærogativis Primogenitorum in Eccl. Vet. This subject, and the closely related one of the consecration of the Levites in the room of the first-born, is so ably and satisfactorily discussed there, that little has been left for subsequent inquirers. Of the general practice in appointing persons to exercise priestly functions, where no separate order existed for the purpose, and which prevailed in common with God's more ancient worshippers and many heathen nations, he says, "Nothing is more certain, than that the ancients required sacrifices to be performed, either by princes and heads of families, or by persons singularly gifted in body and mind, as being deemed more deserving than others of the divine fellowship." This holds especially of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Of the former, Müller says, that "the worship of a deity peculiar to any tribe was, from the beginning, common to all the members of the tribe; that those who governed the people in the other concerns of life, naturally presided over their religious observances, the heads of families in private, and the rulers in the community; and that it might be said, with just as much truth, that the kings were priests as that the priests were kings." And so much was it the practice in the properly historical periods of Greece, to have priestly offices performed by means of public magistrates or persons delegated by the community, that he does not think "there ever was in Greece a priesthood, strictly speaking, in contradistinction to the laity."—(Introd. to Mythology, p. 187, 188, Trans.) Livy testifies that among the early Romans the care of the sacred things devolved upon their kings, and that after the expulsion of these, a special officer was appointed with the name of Rex Sacrorum (L. II. 2.) It was still customary, however, as is well known, for private families to perform their own peculiar sacrifices and libations to the gods. On special occasions, besides, persons were temporarily appointed for the performance of sacred offices, as on the occasion of the taking of Veiæ, thus related by Livy, v. c. 22: "Delecti ex omni exercitu juvenes, pure lotis corporibus, candida veste, quibus deportanda Romam Regina Juno assignata erat, venerabundi templum iniere, primo religiose admoventes manus; quod id signum more Etrusco, nisi certæ gentis sacerdos, attrectare non esset solitus." In Virgil, we find: "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos" (Æn. iii. 80,) on which Servius remarks: "Sane majorem hæc erat consuetudo, ut rex etiam esset sacerdos vel pontifex, unde hodie-que Imperatores pontifices dicimus." So also Aristotle, speaking of the heroic times, says: στρατηγος γαρ ην και δικαστης ο βασιλευς, και των προς τους θεους κυριος, (Pol. iii. 14.)

There was nothing peculiar, therefore, in the fact of Melchizedec having been at once a king and a priest. The only remarkable thing was, that among such a people he should have been a priest of "the Most High God," and so certainly called of God to the office, that even Abraham recognised his title to the honour. This must, in all probability, have arisen from his singularly righteous character, and his zeal for the divine worship and glory, rendering it manifest to all, that he was emphatically a messenger of Heaven to that age and people. It is impossible with any certainty to trace the transition from this to that other state of things, which prevailed in some ancient countries, and in which the priests existed as an entirely separate class, a distinct caste. Yet, in regard especially to Egypt, the country where such a state of things probably originated, the transition may have implied no very great change, and may have been quite easily effected. For, it is now understood, that the earlier kings there were *priest-kings*, either belonging to the priest-caste, or held in great dependence by that body; that the land was originally peopled by a kind of priest-colonies, who either appointed one of their number to rule in the name of a certain god, or at least formed, in connexion with the ruler, the reigning portion of the community. The members of this caste consequently were the first proprietors of lands in each district. Even by the account of Herodotus, they appear still in his day to have been the principal landed proprietors; each temple in a particular district had extensive estates, as well as a settlement of priests connected with it, which formed the original territory of the settlement, and were subsequently, at least, farmed out for the good of the whole; so that "the families of priests were the first, the highest, and the richest in the country; they had exclusively the transacting of all state affairs, and carried on many of the most profitable branches of business (judges, physicians, architects, &c.,) and were to a certain extent a *highly privileged nobility*." (Heeren, Af. i. p. 368; ii. p. 112-129; Wilkinson, i. 245, &c.)

of sacred history, it should rather have been matter of surprise if any had appeared. For in those times every thing in religion among the true worshippers of God was characterized by the greatest simplicity and freedom. They possessed as yet no temple, nor even any select consecrated place, in which their offerings were to be presented and their vows paid. Wherever they happened to dwell, in the open field or under the shade of a spreading tree, they built an altar and called upon the name of God. And it would have been a sort of anomaly, an institution at variance with the character of the worship and the general state of things, if there had been a kind of artificial order of men, separated from all others and appointed exclusively to minister in holy things.

But this being the case, does it not seem like a travelling in the wrong direction, to institute at last an order of priests for that purpose? Was not this to mar the simplicity of God's worship, and throw a new restraint around the freedom of access to him? In one sense unquestionably it was; and separating, as it did, between the offering and him in whose behalf it was presented, it introduced into the worship of God an element of imperfection which cleaves to all the Old Testament sacrifices. In this respect it was a more perfect state of things which permitted the offerer himself to bring near his offering to God, and one that has, therefore, been restored under the gospel dispensation. But in other respects the worship of God made a great advance under the ministration of Moses, and an advance of such a nature as imperatively to require the institution of a separate priesthood. So that what was in itself an imperfection, became relatively an advantage, and a necessary help to something better.—The patriarchal religion, while it was certainly characterized by simplicity, was at the same time vague and general in its nature. The ideas it imparted concerning divine things were few, and the impressions it produced upon the minds of the worshippers must, from the very character of the worship, have been somewhat faint and indefinite. By the time of Moses, however, the world had already gone so far in the pomps and ceremonies of a false worship, that on that ground alone it became necessary to institute a much more varied and complicated service; and the Lord, taking advantage of the evil to accomplish a higher good, ordered the religion he now set up in such a manner, as to bring out far more fully his own character, and prepare the way more effectually for the work and kingdom of Christ. The groundwork of this new form of religion stood in the erection of the tabernacle, which God chose for his peculiar dwelling-place, and through which he meant to keep up a close and lively intercourse with his people. But this intercourse would inevitably have grown on their part into too great familiarity, and would thus have failed to produce proper and salutary impressions upon the minds of the worshippers, unless something of a counteracting tendency had been introduced, fitted to beget feelings of profound and reverential awe toward the God, who condescended to come so near to them. This could no otherwise be effectually done, than by the

institution of a separate priesthood, whose prerogative alone it should be to enter within the sacred precincts of God's house, and perform the ministrations of his worship. And so wisely was every thing arranged concerning the work and service of this priesthood, that an awful sense of the holiness and majesty of the Divine Being could hardly fail to be awakened in the most unthinking bosom, while still there was given to the spiritual worshipper a visible representation of his near relationship to God, and his calling to intimate communion with him.

For, the Levitical priesthood was not made to stand, as the priesthood of Egypt certainly stood, in a kind of antagonism to the people, or in such a state of absolute independence and exclusive isolation, as gave them the appearance of a class entirely by themselves. On the contrary, this priesthood in its office was the representative of the whole people in its divine calling as the property of God; it was a priesthood formed out of a kingdom of priests; and, consequently, the persons in whom it was vested could only be regarded as having, in the higher and more peculiar sense, what essentially belonged to the entire community. In them only were concentrated and manifestly displayed the spiritual privileges and dignity of all true Israelites. And as these were represented in the priesthood generally, so especially in the person of the High-priest, in whom again every thing belonging to the priesthood gathered itself up and culminated. "This high-priest," to use the words of Vitringa,* "represented the whole people. All Israelites were reckoned as being in him. The prerogative held by him belonged to the whole of them, but on this account was transferred to him, because it was impossible that all Israelites should keep themselves holy, as became the priests of Jehovah. But that the Jewish high-priest did indeed personify the whole body of the Israelites, not only appears from this, that he bore the names of all the tribes on his breast and his shoulders—which unquestionably imported that he drew near to God in the name and stead of all—but also from this, that when he committed any heinous sin, his guilt was imputed to the people. Thus, in Lev. iv. 3, 'If the priest that is anointed sin to the trespass or guilt of the people,' (improperly rendered in English version, 'according to the sin of the people.') The anointed priest was the high-priest. But when he sinned, the people sinned. Wherefore? Because he represented the whole people. And on this account it was, that the sacrifice for a sin committed by him had to be offered as the public sacrifices were, which were presented for sin committed by the people at large: the blood must be brought into the Holy place, and the body burned without the camp."

There was even more than what is here mentioned to impress the idea, that the priesthood possessed only transferred rights. For, as the sins of the high-priest were regarded as the people's, so theirs also were regarded as his, and on the great day of atonement, when

* Obs. Sac. i. p. 292.

the most peculiar part of his work came to be discharged, he had, in their name and stead, to enter into the Most Holy Place with the blood of sprinkling, and thereafter confess all their sins and iniquities over the head of the live goat. On other occasions also, we find this impersonation of Israel by the high priest coming distinctly out, as in Judges xx. 27, 28, where, not the people (as the construction in our version might seem to imply) but Phinehas in the name of the people asks, "Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin, my brother?" and receives the answer: "Go up, for to-morrow I will deliver them into thine hand." Besides, in one most important respect, the priestly function was still allowed to remain in the hands of the people, after the consecration of Aaron and his family. The paschal lamb, which might justly be regarded as in a peculiar sense the sacrifice of the covenant, was by the covenant-people themselves presented to the Lord and its flesh eaten; which was manifestly designed to keep up a perpetual testimony to the truth of their being a kingdom of priests. So Philo plainly understood it, when he describes it as the custom at the passover, "not that the laity should bring the sacrificial animals to the altar, and the priests offer them, but the whole people," says he, "according to the prescription of the law, exercise priestly functions, since each one for his own part presents the appointed sacrifices."* And as thus the priestly functions of the people were plainly not intended to be destroyed by the institution of the Aaronic priesthood, but were only, at the most, transferred to that body, and represented in them, we can easily understand how pious Israelites, like the Psalmist, could read their own privileges in those of the priests, and speak of "coming into the house of God," and even of "dwelling in it all the days of their life."† Betokening, however, as the institution of such a priesthood did, a relative degree of imperfection on the part of the people, we can also easily understand how the spirit of prophecy, when pointing to a higher and more perfect dispensation, should have intimated the purpose of God to make the priestly order again to cease, by the unreserved communication to the people of its distinctive privileges: "Ye shall be named the priests of the Lord, men shall call you the ministers of our God."‡ This purpose began to be realized from the time that, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, believers were constituted a "royal priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices to God," and is destined to be realized in the fullest sense in the future kingdom of glory, when the redeemed shall be able with one voice to say, "Thou hast made us kings and priests unto our God."

The relation, then, in which the Levitical priesthood stood to the people, still consisted with the preservation, to a considerable extent, of their spiritual privileges; even through such an institution they could see the dignity of their standing before God, and their right to hold near communion with him. But if in this part

* Vita Mosis, iii. p. 686. † Ps. v. 7; xxvii. 4, &c.

‡ Isa. lxi. 6; lxvi. 21; Jer. xxxiii. 22, on which last see Hengstenberg's Christol.; as also in Zech. iii. 1, for some good remarks on the subject now under discussion.

of the arrangement care was taken to keep up a sense of the grace and condescension of God toward the whole covenant-people, care was also taken, on the other hand, by means of the priesthood's peculiar relation to God, to keep up a sense of his adorable majesty and untainted righteousness. For however the people were warranted to regard themselves as admitted by representation into the habitation of God, still personally they were obliged to stand at an awful distance. One tribe alone was selected and set apart to the office of handling the things that concerned it. But not even the whole of this tribe was permitted to enter the sacred precincts of God's house and minister in its appropriate services. That honour was reserved for one family of the tribe—the family of Aaron—and even the members of that family could not be allowed to discharge the duties of their priestly office without the most solemn rites of consecration; nor, when consecrated, could they all alike traverse with freedom the courts of the tabernacle; one individual of them alone could pass the veil into its innermost region, the peculiar dwelling-place of God, and he only in such a manner as must have impressed his soul with the awful sanctity of the place, and made him enter with trembling step. Guarded by so many restrictions, and rising through so many gradations, how high must have seemed the dignity, how sublime and sacred the privilege of standing in the presence of the Holy One of Israel, and ministering before him!

II. But we must now inquire into the leading characteristics of this priestly office: what peculiarly distinguished those who exercised it from the nation at large? Nothing for certain can here be learned from the name, (כֹּהֵן, cohen,) the derivation of which is differently given by the learned, and the original import of which cannot now be correctly ascertained. But looking at their position and office in a general light, we cannot fail to regard them as occupying somewhat of the place of God's friends and familiars.* Their part was not to do much in the way of active and laborious service, but rather to receive and present to God, as his nearest friends and associates, what properly belonged to him. And on this account also was a great proportion of the sacrifices divided between God and them; and the show-bread, as well as other meat-offerings, were consumed by them, there being such a close relationship and intimacy between them and God, that it might be regarded as immaterial whether any thing were consumed by them or on the altar of God. But there were evidently three elements entering

* Vitringa (Obs. Sac. i. p. 272,) gives this even as the radical signification of the name *cohen*, "familiarioris accessionis amicum," appealing for proof to Isa. lxi. 10. In this he followed Cocceius, who makes the fundamental idea of the verb to be that of drawing near to a superior. Many after Kimchi understand it of the performing of honourable and dignified service; while many again, in recent times, resort to the Arabic, and find the sense of discovering secret things, prophesying, which they consider as the original one (Pye Smith on Priesthood of Christ, p. 82.) There can be no doubt, however, that whether from use or from original meaning, the word came to convey the idea of something like a familiar or chosen friend or counsellor. Hence David's sons being *priests* (2 Sam. viii. 18,) is explained in 1 Chron. xviii. 17, by their being *at the hand* of the king.

into this general view of their position and office, which together made up the characteristics of the priestly calling, and which are distinctly brought out as such in the description given by Moses on the occasion of Korah's rebellion: "And he spake unto Korah, and unto all his company, saying, To-morrow the Lord will show who is his, and who is holy, and whom he makes to draw near to him; and him, whom he chooses, will he make to draw near to himself," (Numb. xvi. 5.) There can be no doubt, from the connexion in which this stands, that it was intended to be a description of the properties or personal characteristics of a divine calling to the priesthood; for it was intended to meet the assumption of Korah and his company, that as the whole congregation was holy, they had an equal right with Aaron to enter into the tabernacle of God and minister in holy things. The person to whom such a right belonged must be in a peculiar sense God's property, or election, a possessor of holiness, and privileged to draw near to God; which the family of Aaron alone were, and so, to the exclusion of all others, were invested with the priestly function.*

(1.) They were in a peculiar sense God's property, or the objects of his election—for these two expressions properly involve but one idea. The choice of God as well in respect to the priesthood, as to the people at large, exercised itself in selecting a particular portion from the general property of God, to be his peculiar possession. As thus chosen and set apart for God, Israel was his heritage in the earth; and as similarly chosen and set apart for the special work of the priesthood, the family of Aaron was his heritage in Israel. The privilege was to be theirs of drawing peculiarly near to God, and their first qualification for using it, was that they were the objects of his choice. Their designation and appointment must be from above—not assumed as of their own authority, or derived from the choice of their fellow-men—"For no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron," (Heb. v. 4.) Referring to this, and recognising in it the essential distinction of every true Israelite, the Psalmist says, "Blessed is the man *whom thou choosest*, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts," (Ps. lxv. 4.) The grounds of the divine choice in the case of Aaron are nowhere given; nor even when Korah contested with him the right to the office, did the Lord condescend to assign any reason for having selected that family in preference to the other families of Israel; he rather wished his own election to be regarded as the ultimate ground of the distinction, and by making the office hereditary in the family of Aaron,

* It could only be as having these things in *a peculiar sense*, that the Aaronic priesthood were here meant to be described by them. For they were also the characteristics of the congregation generally as a kingdom of priests, and are mentioned as such in the 19th of Exodus. The people are there described as having been "brought unto God," as being chosen for "a peculiar treasure to him," and as "a holy nation." So that every thing was affirmed to be theirs, which was peculiarly to distinguish the family of Aaron. And there can be no doubt, that it was on the ground of this passage, which had made a deep impression upon all the people, that the rebellion of Korah was raised.

he kept the appointment for all coming time, as it were, in his own hands. This does not, however, preclude the possibility of such ostensible grounds of preference existing in Aaron and his family, as might have been sufficient to commend the divine choice to the people: such as his distinguished rank as the first born of the house to which Moses belonged, the services he had already rendered in the cause of Israel, or his personal fitness for the office. But there is no authority for holding with Philo, Maimonides, and other Jewish writers, that the priesthood was conferred on this family as a reward for their zeal and devotedness to the service of God. So far from this, at the very time when the appointment of Aaron was intimated to Moses, he was going along with the people in the worship of the golden calf.*

(2.) The second element in the distinctive properties of the priesthood, was the possession of holiness. Expressly on the ground of holiness being the general characteristic of the people, did the company of Korah assert their claim to the prerogatives of the priesthood; and on this point especially was the trial by means of the twelve rods laid up before the Lord, designed to bear a decisive testimony. The rod of the house of Aaron alone being made to bud, and blossom, and yield almonds, was a visible, miraculous sign from heaven, of a holiness belonging to the family of Aaron, which did not belong to the congregation at large. For holiness is just spiritual life and fruitfulness; and the most natural emblem of that was a rod flourishing and yielding fruit after its kind. Such singular and pre-eminent holiness became those who were to be known as the immediate attendants and familiars of Jehovah, who revealed himself as "the Holy One of Israel." Hence, not only is it said in the general, that "holiness becometh God's house," that is, those who dwell and minister in its courts, but Aaron is called by way of distinction "the saint of the Lord," and the law enjoins with special emphasis respecting the priests as a body, that they should be "holy unto their God;" "for," it is added, "I the Lord that sanctify you, am holy."—(Ps. xciii. 5, cvi. 16; Lev. xxi. 6.) Hence also, as holiness in the priesthood derived the necessity of its existence from the holiness of the being whose attendants they were, it must have been holiness of the same character and description as his; the law of the ten commandments, which was the grand expression of the one, must evidently have been intended to form the proper pattern of the other. It was an excellence, which however it might be symbolized by outward things, could not possibly be formed of these, but must have been a real and personal distinction; as is plainly testified in the description given of the character of those who were originally appointed to fill the sacred functions of the priesthood in Mal. ii. 1—7, and is also distinctly implied in the threatenings uttered against the house of Eli, and their ultimate degradation and ruin, on account of the *moral* impurities into which

* Spencer, De Leg. L. i. c. 8, concurs with the Jewish writers in the reason they assign, and quotes Philo with approbation; naturally enough, as his grand reason for the institution of the priesthood was simply the prevention of idolatry!

they fell. Their wicked course of life disqualified them from holding the sacred office, which must therefore have indispensably required purity in heart and conduct.

(3.) The last distinction belonging to the priesthood, was their right to draw near to God; a right which grew out of their election of God and their eminent holiness, as the end and consummation to which these pointed. The question in the rebellion of Korah was, who were in such a sense chosen by God, and holy, as to be privileged to draw near to him; and the decision of God was given on the two former, with a special respect to this latter prerogative: "And him, whom He chooses, will He make to draw near to himself." Hence, "those who draw near to Jehovah," is not uncommonly given as a description of the priests (Ex. xix. 22; Lev. xxi. 17; Ez. xliii. 13, xliv. 13,) and the distinctive priestly act in all sacrificial services is called "the bringing near," (הקריב) as also the thing sacrificed, is called in its most general designation *corban* (קרבן)—the thing brought near, offering. On this account what is mentioned in one place as "an offering of burnt offerings," is described in another as a "bringing near" of them (2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Chron. xvi. 1.) But this right of the priesthood, of themselves standing peculiarly near to God, and alone being permitted to bring near to him the gifts and offerings of the congregation, of necessity involved the idea of their occupying an intermediate position between God and the people, and gave to their entire work the character of a mediation. "They were ordained for men in things pertaining to God," charged to a certain extent with the interest of both parties, and having especially to transact with God in the behalf of those whom sin had removed to a distance from him. In consequence of their relation of nearness to God and personal interest in his favour, the power was conferred on them of presenting the oblations of others, so as to procure their favourable acceptance and the bestowal in return of the divine blessing. Through them Israel was blessed, as through Israel—the kingdom of priests—all the families of the earth were to be blessed. In the High-priest alone, however, was this function fully realized, as was clearly indicated by the outward distinctions held by him above the other priests, as well as above the people at large. "For to the outward of the High-priest it belonged: First, that while the people, remaining at a greater or less distance from the sanctuary, approached to it only at befitting times, the High-priest, on the contrary, was always in the midst—so that though his functions were few, and confined to certain times, yet his whole existence appeared consecrated; and, secondly, that though the people presented their offerings to God by the collective priesthood, still the sacrifice of the great day of atonement was necessary as a universal completion of the rest; and this the High-priest alone could present. The idea, therefore, of his office seems to be, that while to the Jewish people their national life appeared as an alteration of drawing near to God, and withdrawing again from him, the High-priest was the individual whose life, compared with these vacillating

movements, was in perpetual equipoise; and as the people were always in a state of impurity, he was the only person who could present himself as pure before God."*

III. It was not, however, the sole end of the appointment of the priesthood, to represent the people in the sanctuary, and mediate between them and God in holy things. It belonged also to their office to secure the diffusion among the people of sound knowledge and instruction; so that there might be a right understanding among the people of the nature of God's service, and a fitness for entering in spirit into its duties, while the priests were personally employed in discharging them. A certain amount of such knowledge was necessary, in order that the people might be disposed to bring their gifts and offerings at suitable times, and a still greater, that, in the presentation of these by the hand of the priests, they might be blessed as acceptable worshippers. With the oversight of this, therefore so nearly connected with their sacred employments about the tabernacle, the priesthood were charged: "And that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses," (Lev. x. 11.) So again in Deut. xxxiii. 10, "They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law." The words of Malachi also are express on this point: "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts," (ii. 7.) It was therefore justly charged against them there, as an entire subversion of the great end of their appointment, that instead of teaching others the law, "they caused many to stumble at it;" and the prophet Hosea even ascribes the general ruin to their neglect of this part of their functions: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge; because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me," (iv. 6.)

The office of the priesthood thus necessarily involved somewhat of a prophetical or teaching character, and in after times, when those destined lights of Israel became themselves sources of darkness and corruption, prophets were raised up for the express purpose of correcting the evil, and supplying the information which the others had failed to impart. It is plain, however, that even if the priests had been faithful to this part of their calling, they were quite inadequate, from their limited number, to be personally in any proper sense the teachers of all Israel. It is true, they enjoyed peculiar advantages for this in the frequent recurrence of the stated feasts, which caused the people to assemble in one place thrice every year, and kept them each time for a week at the very centre of priestly influence. But much beside what could then be accomplished would require to be done, to preserve any due acquaintance with the law of God, and give instruction from time to time concerning numberless cases of doubt or difficulty, which in daily life would be certain to arise. On this account, more par-

* Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre, as quoted by Tholuck, in Diss. ii. in Com. on Ep. to Hebr., Bib. Cabinet, xxxix. p. 265.

ticularly, were the Levites associated with the priesthood, and planted at proper distances in certain cities throughout the tribes of Israel. They were "given to Aaron and his sons," to minister unto him in subordinate and preparatory offices, while he was doing the service of the tabernacle, and generally "to execute the service of the Lord." (Numb. iii. 5, 10.*) In fulfilling this appointment it fell to them to keep the tabernacle and its instruments in a proper state for the divine service, to bear its different parts, when removing from place to place, to occupy in later times the post of door-keepers in the temple, to take part in the musical arrangements connected with the public service, to assist at the larger feasts in the killing and flaying of victims, &c. (1 Chron. xxiii. 28, 32; 2 Chron. xxxv. 6, 11.) But separated as the Levites were, from the secular employments, without lands to cultivate, and "wholly given to the service of the Lord," it was obviously but a small number of them who could be regularly occupied with such ministrations about the sanctuary; and as both their abundant leisure and their dispersion through the land, gave them many opportunities of acting as the spiritual instructors of the people, it must have been chiefly through their instrumentality, that the priests were to keep the people acquainted with the statutes and judgments of the Lord. This is clearly implied, indeed, in those passages which speak most distinctly of the obligation laid upon the priesthood to diffuse the knowledge of the law, and which refer equally to the priests and the Levites. Thus their common calling to "teach Jacob God's judgments and Israel his law," is announced in the blessing of Moses upon the whole tribe (Deut. xxxiii. 8, 11;) and in Malachi the failure of the priesthood to instruct the people in divine knowledge, and their guilt in causing many to err from the law, is called a "corruption of the covenant of Levi."

Indeed, common discretion and self-interest, as well as the principles of piety, must have enforced upon them this obligation, and dictated the employment of active measures for the diffusion of divine knowledge by the instrumentality of the Levites. If these possessed the spirit of their office as men dedicated to the Lord's service, in subordination to the priesthood, they must have felt it their duty to prepare the minds of the people for the solemnities of the tabernacle worship, much more than to prepare the instruments of the tabernacle itself for the same. A moment's reflection must have taught them, that their services, as ministering helps to promote the ends of the priesthood, were greatly more necessary for the one purpose than the other. But if higher considerations should fail to influence them in the matter, they were still urged

* They were given to Aaron, the Lord's familiar, as a sacrifice offered up and consecrated to the Lord in the room of the first-born. The first-born, at the deliverance from Egypt, had represented all the people, in them all the people were redeemed: so now the people, when substituting the Levites in their place, had to lay their hands on their heads, and Aaron waved them before the Lord as an offering; and as originally God accepted the blood of the lamb for the blood of the first-born, so now he accepted a burnt-offering and a sin-offering for the Levites, on which they had to place their hands (Num. iii. and viii.)

to exert themselves in this direction from a regard to their own comfortable maintenance, which was made principally to depend upon the tithes and offerings of the people. The chief source of revenue was the tithe, which belonged to the tribe of Levi, from their being in a peculiar sense the Lord's own—the whole property being represented by the number ten, and one of these being constantly taken as a tribute-money or pledge, that the whole was held in fief or dependence upon him. Then, out of this tithe accruing to the entire tribe, another tithe was taken and devoted to the family of Aaron, as the peculiarly sacred portion of the tribe. But for the actual payment of these tithes and the other offerings of the people in which they had a share, the priests and Levites were dependent on the enlightened and faithful consciences of the people. The rendering of what was due, was simply a matter of religious obligation, and where this failed, the claim could not be enforced by any constraint of law. It consequently became indispensable to the very existence of the sacred tribe, that they should be at pains to preserve and elevate the religious sense of the community, as with this their own respect and comfort were inseparably connected. And when they proved unfaithful to their charge, as the representatives of God's interest, and the expounders of his law among the people (as they appear to have done in the age of Malachi) their sin was visited upon them, in just retribution, by a withdrawal on the part of the people of the appointed offerings. So that although nothing was said as to the particular means proper to be employed for the purpose (the church being left then, as in New Testament times, to discharge the obligation laid upon it by suitable arrangements,) there can be no doubt, that the obligation was imposed upon the priesthood to be partly themselves, and still more through their ministers the Levites, the teachers of the people in divine knowledge. The proper discharge of the priestly, pre-supposed and required a certain discharge of the prophetical function; and prophets, as extraordinary messengers, were only sent to chastise their unfaithfulness and rouse them from their lethargy, and were at last instituted as a distinct and separate order, only to supply what was found to be a lack of service on the part of those regular instructors. Indeed, as the members of the prophetical order seem generally to have been taken from the tribe of Levi, the institution of that order may be regarded as a perfecting of the Levitical office in one of its departments of duty.*

* Vitr. Synag. Vet. L. i. P. 2, c. 8, where also see various Jewish authorities in proof of the calling of the Levites to be teachers and expounders of the law, and especially one from Baal Hatturim, which expressly assigns this as the reason of the dispersion of the Levites among the Israelites, (dispergentur per omnes Israelitas ad docendam legem.) See also Movers' Kronik, p. 300, and Graves on Pent. ii. Lec. 4. Michaelis (Com. on Laws of Moses, i. art. 35, 52,) has asserted, that a great many civil and literary offices belonged to the priests and Levites—that they were not only ministers of religion, but physicians, judges, scribes, mathematicians, &c., holding the same place in Israelitish, that the Egyptian priesthood did in Egyptian society—and that on this account alone were such large revenues assigned them. This view has been too often followed by divines, especially those of the rationalist school, and is still too much countenanced in the Bib. Cyclop. Art. Priest, and even

IV. Now, the outward and bodily prescriptions which were given respecting the priesthood, were merely intended to serve by their observance as symbolical expressions of the ideas, we have seen to be involved in the nature of their calling and office. It is not necessary for us to enter into any minute detail concerning them; and we shall content ourselves with briefly noticing some of the leading points.

(1.) There were, first, personal marks and distinctions of a bodily kind, the possession of which was necessary to qualify any one for the priesthood, and the absence of which was to prove an utter disqualification. These, therefore, being manifestly given or withheld by God, bore upon the question of a person's election; and when not possessed, bespoke the invidual not to be chosen by God in the peculiar sense required for the priestly office. Such were all kinds of bodily defects; it was declared a profanation of the altar or the sanctuary for any one to draw near in whom they appeared. (Lev. xxi. 16, 24.) Not that the Lord cared for the bodily appearance in himself, but through the body sought to convey suitable impressions regarding the soul. For completeness of bodily parts is to the body what, in the true religion, holiness is to the soul; to the requirement or the production of this holiness, as the perfection of man's spiritual nature, the whole of the Mosaic institutions were bent; and as signs and witnesses to Israel concerning it, those who occupied the high position of being at once God's and the people's representatives, must bear upon their persons that external symbol of the spiritual perfection required. The choice of God respecting them must be seen in their possessing the outward symbol of true holiness,*—the age prescribed for the Levites (which was also probably intended to be the same for the priests) entering upon their office, and again ceasing from active service, carried substantially the same meaning. It comprehended the period of the natural life's greatest vigour and com-

by Mr. Taylor in his Spiritual Despotism, p. 99. It is entirely, however, without foundation, and has been thoroughly disproved by Baehr (Symbolik, ii. p. 34, 53,) and by Hengstenberg, who has shown, that the Levites, as well as the priests, were set apart only for religious purposes, and that in particular the civil constitution as to judges, as settled by Moses, was just the revival and improvement of that patriarchal government, which had still not been altogether destroyed in Egypt (Authentie, ii. p. 260, 341, 654, &c.) There can be no doubt, that the Egyptian and Indian priests held many of the offices referred to; that their political went hand in hand with their religious influence; and that, especially in Egypt, the most fertile lands belonged to them, with many other lucrative resources. It was very different with the Levitical priesthood—no lands worth naming—a dependence upon the offerings of the people for their livelihood--so that they are commended to the care of the people, as objects of kindness with the widow and orphan, (Deut. xii. 11; xvi. 11, 14,) and were often from the low state of religion in comparative want.

* The Greeks and Romans, it is well known, were very particular in regard to the corporeal soundness and even beauty of their priests. Among the former every one underwent a careful examination as to his bodily frame, before he entered on the priestly office; and among the Romans there are instances of persons resigning the office on receiving some corporeal blemish—such as M. Sergius, who lost his hand in the defence of his country. But holiness was not the perfection aimed at in those religions; and such regard was paid to bodily completeness merely because it was thought a token of divine favour, and of good success. Hence Seneca, Controv. iv. 2; Sacerdos non integri corporis quasi mali ominis res vitanda est. See Baehr, ii. p. 59.

pleteness, and, as such, indicated that the spiritual life should be in a corresponding state. The age of entry is stated in Numb. iv., at thirty, while in ch. viii. twenty-five is given; but the former has respect simply to the work of the Levites about (not *at* or *in*) the tabernacle, in transporting it from place to place; the latter speaks of the period of their entering on their duties generally; and it would seem that the practice latterly made it even so early as twenty. (1 Chron. xxiii. 27; 2 Chron. xxxi. 17.*)

(2.) Then, certain restrictions of an external kind were laid upon the priests, as to avoiding occasions of bodily defilement; such as, contact with the dead, excepting in cases of nearest relationship, cutting and disfiguring the hair of the beard, as in times of mourning, marrying a person of bad fame, or one that had been divorced; and the high-priest, as being in his own person the most sacred, was still farther restricted, so that he was not to defile himself even for his father or mother, and should marry only a virgin. These observances were enjoined as palpable symbols of the holiness in walk and conduct, which became those who stood so near to the Holy One of Israel. Occupying the blessed region of life and purity, they must exhibit in their external relations and deportment the care and jealousy, with which it behooves every one to watch against all occasions of sin, who would live in fellowship with the righteous Jehovah.

(3.) The garments appointed to be worn by the priesthood in their sacred ministrations were also, in some respects, strikingly expressive of the holiness required in their personal state, while in certain parts of the high-priest's dress other ideas were besides symbolized. The stuff of all of them was linen, and with the exception of the more ornamental parts of the high-priest's dress, the colour was white. The coolness and comparative freedom from perspiration attending the use of linen garments had led men to associate with them, especially in the warm clime of Egypt, the idea of cleanliness; their symbolical use, therefore, in an ethical religion like the Mosaic, must have been expressive of inward purity; and hence, in the symbolical language of Revelation, we read so often of the white and clean garments of the heavenly inhabitants, which are expressly declared to mean "the righteousness of saints." (Rev. xix. 8, iv. 4, vi. 11, &c.) Hence, also, on the day of atonement, the plain white linen garments which the high-priest was to wear, are called "garments of holiness"—plainly implying, that the idea of holiness was peculiarly indicated by the qualities referred to. The same idea, however, was emblazoned—not properly symbolized, but distinctly expressed—in the plate of gold which was attached to the front of the high-priest's bonnet or mitre, and which had engraved upon it "Holiness to the Lord." This became the more necessary in his case, on account of the rich embroidery and manifold ornaments which belonged to other parts of his dress, and which were fitted to lessen the impression

* Hengstenberg, Authentie, ii. p. 393; Relandi, Antiq. ii. 6, 3; Lightfoot, Op. ii. p. 691.

of holiness, that the fine white linen of some of them might otherwise have been sufficient to convey. The representative character of the high-priest was symbolized by the breast-plate of the Ephod, which in twelve precious stones bore the names of the tribes of the children of Israel; indicating that in their name and behalf he appeared in the presence of God. The Urim and Thummim (lights and perfections) connected with the breast-plate, if not identical with it, and through which, in cases of emergency, he obtained unerring responses from Heaven, bespoke the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the mind and will of God, with which he should be endowed to fit him for giving a clear direction to the people in the things of God, and the perfect rectitude of the decisions he would consequently pronounce respecting them—The girdle, with which his flowing garments were bound together, indicated the high and honourable service in which he was engaged; and the bells and pomegranates, which were wrought upon the lower edge of the tunic below the Ephod, bespoke the distinct utterances he was to give of the divine word, and the fruitfulness in righteousness, of which this should be productive. Finally, the fine quality of the stuff, of which all the garments of the priests were made, and the gold, and diversified colours, and rich embroidery appearing in the ordinary garments of the high-priest, were manifestly designed to express the elevated rank and dignity of those who are recognised by God as sons in his house, permitted to draw near with confidence to his presence, and to go in and out before him.*

* We have not specified in detail the different parts of the priest's garments; they consisted, in the case of the priesthood generally, of breeches or drawers of linen, a coat or tunic reaching from the neck to the ankles and wrists, an embroidered girdle, and a mitre or turban (the usual parts, in fact, of an oriental dress;) but in the case of the high-priest there were beside these a mantle or robe of blue, worn over the inner coat or tunic, and immediately under the ephod, then the ephod itself, a sort of short coat, very richly embroidered and ornamented, with its corresponding girdle and breast-plate, with the Urim and Thummim, which was regarded as the peculiar and distinctive garment of the high-priest, who is thence often described as he "who wore the Ephod." (Common linen ephods, however, were worn by the priests generally, and sometimes even by laymen.) That there was much in these garments peculiar to the Israelites, and differing from what existed in Egypt, we think Baehr has conclusively established. For example, the tunics of the Egyptian priests appear to have reached only from the haunch to the feet, leaving the upper part naked, the mitres were of a different shape, and fell back upon the neck, the girdle seems not to have been used, but they wore shoes, and on great occasions leopard skins, which the Israelitish priests did not, (Symbolik, ii. p. 92.) It is clear, therefore, there could be no slavish imitation, as Spencer and others have laboured to prove. Yet this by no means hinders but that there might have been in some leading particulars the same symbols employed to represent substantially the same ideas. That this was the case in regard to the white linen garments seems indisputable; Spencer's proofs there, as Hengstenberg remarks against Baehr, (Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 146,) are quite conclusive. Such dresses were peculiar only to the priests of Egypt and Palestine, as symbolic of cleanliness or purity—hence the former were called by Juvenal "grex liniger," by Ovid "linigera turba," by Martial "linigeri calvi," by Seneca "linteali senes."—Spencer, de Leg. L. iii. c. 5, s. 2. There does seem also to have been a reference in the Urim and Thummim to the practice in Egypt of suspending the image of the goddess Thmei, who was honoured under the twofold character of truth and justice, from the neck of the chief judge, (see Hengstenberg as above, p. 150, with the quotations there, especially from Wilkinson.) Still there was a very distinctive difference, in that the high-priest was not properly a judge, but entirely spiritual in his character and office, was only

(4.) Lastly, the rites of consecration proclaimed the necessity of holiness—a holiness not their own, but imputed to them by the grace of God, and following upon this, and flowing from the same source, a plentiful endowment of gifts for their sacred office, with the manifest seal of Heaven's fellowship and approval. They were first brought to the door of the tabernacle and washed—as in themselves impure, and requiring the application of water, the simplest and commonest element of cleansing. Then, the body being thus purified, the pontifical garments were put on, and on the high-priest first, afterwards on the other priests was poured the holy anointing oil, which ran down to the skirt of the garments. This was the peculiar act of consecration, and symbolized the conferring upon those who received it, of the Spirit's grace, so as to make them fit and active instruments in discharging the duties of God's service. As such anointing had already stamped the tabernacle as God's hallowed abode, so now did it hallow them to be his proper agents and servitors within its courts, (p. 178.) But, different from the senseless materials of the tabernacle, these anointed priests have consciences defiled with the pollution, and laden with the guilt of sin. And how can they stand with this in the presence of Him, who is a consuming fire to sinners, and minister before him? The more they have partaken of the unction of the Holy One, the more must they have felt the necessity of another kind of cleansing than they had yet received, and raised in their souls a cry for the blood of atonement and reconciliation. This, therefore, was what was next provided, and through an entire series of sacrifices and offerings they were conducted, as from the depths of guilt and condemnation, to what indicated their possession of a state of blessed peace and most friendly intercourse with God. Even Jewish writers did not fail to mark the gradation in the order of the sacrifices. "For first of all," says one of them, "there was presented for the expiation of sin the bullock of sin-offering, of which nothing save a little fat was offered (on the altar) to God, (the flesh being burned without the camp;) because the offerers were not yet worthy to have any gift or offering accepted by God. But after they had been so far purged, they slew the burnt-offering to God, which was wholly laid upon the altar. And after this came a sacrifice like a peace-offering (which was wont to be divided between God, the priests, and the offerers,) showing that they were now so far received into favour with God, that they might eat at his table."*

This last offering is called "the ram of consecration," or of "filling," because the portions of it to be consumed upon the altar with its accompanying meat offering, were put into Aaron's hands,

represented as having a sure revelation, if he but waited faithfully upon God, to guide the people to all right knowledge of God and a true judgment of matters as between them and God. For direct consultation with God, the Urim and Thummim seems only to have been used in cases of emergency, when ordinary resources failed. And what it was precisely, or how responses were obtained by it, cannot now be ascertained.

* R. Levi Ben Gerson, as quoted by Outram, De Sac. p. 56.

that he might present and wave them before the Lord. Being counted worthy to have his hands filled with these, the representatives of what he was to be presenting and eating before the Lord, he was thereby, in a manner, installed in his office. But first he had to be sprinkled with the blood of the victim—the blood in which the life is—and which, after being sprinkled on the altar, and so uniting him to God, was applied to his body, signifying the conveyance of a new life to him, a life out of death from God, and in union with God. Nor was Aaron's body in the general only sprinkled with this holy life-giving blood, but also particular members apart:—his right ear, to sanctify it to a ready and attentive listening to the law of God, according to which all his service must be regulated; his right hand, and his right foot, that the one might be hallowed for the presentation of sacred gifts to God, and the other for treading his courts and running the way of his commandments. And now, to complete the ceremony, he receives on his person and his garments a second anointing—not simply with the oil, but with the oil and this blood of consecration mingled together—symbolizing the new life of God, in which he is henceforth to move and have his being, in conjunction with the Spirit, on whose softening, penetrating, invigorating influence all the powers and movements of that divine life depend. So that the Levitical priesthood appeared emphatically as one coming "by water and by blood;" it spoke aloud, in all its rites of consecration, of sin on man's part, and holiness on God's; the memorials of human guilt and the emblems of divine sanctity must at once meet on the persons of those who exercise it; theirs must be clean hands and a pure heart, regenerated nature, a heaven-derived, heaven-sustained life; the signs and fruits of a living connexion with God, as to them a Redeemer from sin, and a quickening Spirit.*

* The full meaning of the offerings connected with the consecration of the priests will only appear when we have considered the various kinds of sacrifices employed on the occasion. We could only give at present the general import. The whole was repeated seven times, on as many successive days—seven the symbol of the oath or covenant, indicating that the consecration to the priestly office was a strictly covenant transaction. That it was done, not merely seven times, but on seven successive days, might also be intended to indicate its completeness—a week of days being the shortest complete revolution of time. That the parts of the peace and the bread-offering, which were put in Aaron's hand, and which were to be his for ever, were burnt on the altar, and not eaten by Moses, (who here acted by virtue of his special commission as priest,) may have simply arisen from Moses not being able to eat the whole; he had to eat the wave-bread, which might be enough; as also what remained over of the parts given to Aaron to be eaten, were to be burnt (Ex. xxix. 34.) We see nothing, therefore, in that arrangement to be regarded as a difficulty, though Kurtz has noted it as one (Mosaische Opfer, p. 249.) The action of the second anointing we have explained substantially with Baumgarten, and not differing very materially from Baehr (Symb. ii. 424, &c.) We are surprised that Mr. Bonar (Comm. on Lev. p: 160) should regard the first anointing as the consecration of the *man*, the second as that of the *priest*—for at the first as well as the second, Aaron had on the priest's garments, and nothing could more distinctly intimate, that what was afterwards done had respect to him as priest. The fire which came out from before the Lord and consumed the burnt-offering on the altar, the first which Aaron presented for the people, (Lev. ix. 24,) was the public seal of God to Aaron as high-priest, denoting that he was accepted in his office, and that the offerings presented by him

V. In applying now what was ordained respecting the Levitical priesthood to the higher things of Christ's kingdom, we find, indeed, every where a shadow of these, but "not the very image" of them. The resemblances were such as imperfect, earthly materials, and an instrumentality of sinful beings could present to the heavenly and divine—inevitably presenting, therefore, some important and palpable differences. Thus, from the High-priest being taken from among men, he necessarily partook of their sinfulness, and required to be himself cleansed by rites and offerings, to be invested with what might be denominated an artificial, imputed holiness, in order that he might mediate between the Holy God and his sinful fellow-men. And then, that he might go through such a process of purification as might raise him to a proper religious elevation above his brethren, there were meanwhile needed the ministrations of one standing between him and God; the mediator of the covenant, who consecrated, had of necessity to be different from, and higher than the person who was consecrated for High-priest. These were obvious, though unavoidable imperfections, even as regarded the preparatory dispensation itself; and it must have suggested itself as manifestly a more perfect arrangement, could it have been obtained, if the High-priest had been possessor of the nature, without being partaker of the guilt of his brethren, and by his inherent qualities had united in his own person what fitted him to be at once mediator and High-priest over the house of God.

Now, this is precisely what first meets us in the gospel constitution of the kingdom; and the defects and imperfections, which gave a sort of anomalous and arbitrary character to the arrangements under the Old Testament, have no place whatever here. He who is the mediator is also the High-priest of his people; and while partaker of flesh and blood like the brethren, yet being "without sin," "holy, harmless, and undefiled," he needed no offerings and ablutions to consecrate him to the office of priesthood. At once very God and true man, the Eternal Son in personal union with real though spotless humanity, he was thoroughly qualified to act the part of the days-man between the Father and his sinful children, being able to "lay his hand upon them both." Who could appear as he the friend and familiar of God?—he, who was in the bosom of the Father, and who could say in the fullest sense, "I and the Father are one?"—who even as the Son of Man, appearing in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet himself had no fellowship with the accursed thing, but ever abhorred it to the uttermost? With the divine and human thus meeting, all purely in his person,

and his sons would be owned and blessed. The rites of consecration differ materially from those used in Egypt. In particular the shaving of the whole body, which was practised in Egypt every three days (Herod. ii. 37,) and kept the head as well as the body generally bald; was quite omitted here. It was done at first, but only then, with the Levites (Numb. viii.) as an act of cleansing, along with sprinkling with water and washing of the clothes. It seems hence to have been regarded as a symbol of an inferior kind, as the consecration of the Levites was much less solemn than that of the priests.

he has every thing that could be desired to render him the proper Head and High-priest of his people. The arrangement for reconciling Heaven and earth, and re-establishing the intercourse between lost man and his Creator, is absolutely perfect, and leaves nothing to be desired. On the one side, as the Beloved Son of God, in whom the Father is well-pleased, he has at all times free access to the presence of the Father, and in whatever he asks must also have power as a prince to prevail. On the other, as the representative of his people, and one in nature with themselves, they can at all times make known with confidence to him the sins and sorrows of their condition, and recognising what is his as theirs, can rise up through him with holy boldness to realize their near relationship to God, and their full participation in the favour and blessing of Heaven.

And can we think thus of the God-man as the head of restored humanity, and in his condition the living pattern after which that of all believers is to be formed, without feeling constrained to say, not only how admirable is the arrangement, but also how amazing the condescension! How wonderful, that the Most High should thus accommodate himself to man's nature and necessities! And how wonderful, on the other hand, that he should elevate this nature into such near and personal union with himself, and for the sake of establishing a fit medium of interpretation and intercourse between the creature and the Creator, should make it his own eternal habitation and instrument of working! It is this pre-eminently which crowns our nature with dignity and honour, and displays, as in a glass, to what a peerless height redeemed humanity is destined. We know not what we shall be, but we know that we shall be like *him* in whom our nature is linked in closest union with the Godhead; and to have our lot and destiny bound up with his, is assuredly to possess the heirship of all that is best and greatest in creation.

In accomplishing this great work of mediation, however, the High-priest of our profession, like the earthly type, "must have somewhat to offer." And here, again, where the very heart and centre of his work is concerned, such differences discover themselves as betoken the one only to have been the imperfect shadow, not the exact image of the other. For under the Old Testament priesthood, the offerer was different, not only from the thing offered, but also, for the most part, from the person on whose behalf the offering was presented. And so impossible was it, amid the imperfections of the shadow, to combine these properly together, that on the great day of atonement it was found necessary to cause the High-priest to offer first for himself apart, and then for the people apart. But now that the perfect things of God's kingdom have come, this imperfection also has disappeared. The one grand offering, through which Christ has finished transgression, made an end of sin, and brought in the everlasting righteousness, was at once furnished by himself, and offered by himself. He gave himself to death as thus laden with their guilt, an offering of a sweet

smelling savour to God, and rose again for their justification, as one fully able of himself to provide and to do every thing to close up the breach which sin had made between man and God.

Yet, while there were such imperfections as we have noted, rendering the Levitical priesthood but a defective representation of the Christian, there were, at the same time, many striking resemblances, and the fundamental principles connected with the priesthood of Christ, were as fully embodied there, as it was possible for them to be in a single institution. For,

(1.) The Levitical priesthood was for Israel the one medium of acceptable approach to God. Aaron and his sons were called, and alone called, to the office of presenting all the offerings of the people at the house of God, and securing for them the blessing. And the attempt made on one occasion to supersede the appointment, and dispense with their ministrations, only led to the discomfiture and perdition of those who impiously attempted it. What else can be the result of any similar attempt under the gospel? A far higher necessity, indeed, reigns here, and any dishonour done to Jesus in his priestly function must be revenged with a much sorer condemnation. The one mediator between God and man, no one can come to the Father but by him; and they only who are redeemed by his blood, and presented by him to the Father as his own ransomed and loved church, can be accepted to blessing and glory. Therefore, it is the Father's will that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; and salvation by any other name than that of Jesus is absolutely unattainable.

(2.) The personal holiness of Christ in his priesthood was also strikingly typified in the consecrations and garments of the Levitical, and especially in the purifications by water and blood. In his case, however, the holiness was not acquired, but original, inherent and self-possessed, manifesting itself in the fulfilment of all righteousness, and magnifying the law of God to the fearful extent of bearing the penalty it had denounced against numberless transgressions. His obedience was such as left no demand of righteousness unsatisfied, and his blood was that of the Lamb of God, without spot or blemish—blood of infinite value. If God accepted the services, and heard the intercessions of the priesthood of old, all lame and imperfect as their righteousness was, how much more may his people now count on the blessing, if they approach in humble reliance on the worth and sufficiency of Christ!

(3.) Then, we see the representative character of his priesthood, and all its functions in that of the High-priest, with the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast when he entered the tabernacle, and with their cause and interest ever before him. Christ, in like manner, does nothing for himself, but only as the shepherd and Saviour of his people. "For their sakes he sanctified himself," by laying down his life to purchase their redemption. And none of them escapes his regard. "He knows his sheep." All the real Israel whom the Father has given to him, are borne upon his bosom within the veil, and shall assuredly reap the fruits of his successful mediation.

(4.) Further, his deep insight into the divine mind, and capacity to give forth certain revelations and unerring judgments of his will, was prefigured in the Urim and Thummin of the Jewish High-priest, the oracular decisions the priesthood generally were authorized to give in the law of God, and the means they were to employ personally, and through the Levites, for diffusing the knowledge of divine truth. "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Himself the Divine Word, through whom Godhead, as it were, speaks and makes itself known to the creatures, it is his part, in all his operations, but especially in the discharge of his priestly functions, to declare the Father. In him as fulfilling the work connected with these is seen, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord; and while he conducts his people to an interest in what he has done for their redemption, it is as the truth that he manifests himself to them. He has even promised to lead them into all the truth, and to fill them with the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

(5.) Once more, in the anointing of the High-priest, we plainly read the connexion between the work of Christ and the agency of the Holy Spirit. As the oil there sanctified all, so the Spirit here seals and works in all. By the power of the Spirit was the flesh of Christ conceived; with the fulness of the Spirit was he endowed at his baptism; all his works were wrought in the Spirit, and by the Spirit did he offer himself without spot to God. The Father hath given the Spirit not by measure to him; and as the oil that was poured on the head of Aaron flowed to the skirt of his garments, so is this Spirit ever ready to descend from Christ to all, even the very lowest members of his body.

The priesthood of Aaron was certainly highly honoured in being made to represent beforehand, in so many points, the eternal priesthood of Christ. But in one respect a manifest blank presents itself, which required to be met by a special corrective. As seen in the Old Testament institution, the priestly bore a distinct and easily recognised connexion with the prophetical or teaching office; but none, or at least a very distant and obscure one, with the kingly. This of necessity arose from God himself being king in Israel when the priesthood was instituted; so that no nearer approximation to the ruling authority could be allowed to the members of the priesthood, than that of being expounders and revealers of the law of the divine King. Something more than this, however, was required to bring out the true character of the Eternal priesthood, especially after the time that an earthly head of the kingly function was appointed, and the priesthood became still less immediately connected with an authority to rule in the house of God. Hence, no doubt, it was that the Spirit of prophecy in directing the expectations of the Church to the coming Messiah, began then so peculiarly to supply what was lacking in the intimations of the existing type, and to make promise of him as "a priest after the order of Melchizedec." (Ps. cx.) There were in reality far more points of similitude to Christ's office in the priest-

hood of Aaron than in that of Melchizedec; but in one very important and prominent respect the one supplied what the other absolutely wanted—Melchizedec being at once a king and a priest, a priest upon the throne. And it was more especially to teach that Messiah should be the same, and in this should differ from the Aaronic priesthood, that such a prediction was then given. It was virtually an assurance to the Church, that the sacerdotal and regal functions, then obviously dissevered, should be united in the person of Him who was to come; and that as the power and splendour of royalty was, in his hands, to be tempered by the tenderness and compassion of the priest, the coming of his kingdom should on that account be looked for with eager expectation. The prediction was again renewed, though without any specific reference to Melchizedec, by Zechariah after the restoration, (ch. vi. 13.) But while this was the main reason and design of the reference,—when the Jews of our Lord's time not only overlooked the leading point of the prediction, but entirely misconceived also the relation that the Levitical priesthood bore to Christ's work and kingdom, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews took occasion to bring out various other and subordinate points of instruction from the prophecy in the 110th Psalm, which it was also fitted to convey. These were mainly directed to the purpose of establishing the conclusion, that the priesthood of our Lord must, by that reference to Melchizedec, have been designed to supersede the priesthood of Aaron, and to be constituted after a higher model; that both in his person and his office, he was to stand pre-eminent above the most honoured of the sons of Abraham, as Melchizedec appears in the history rising above Abraham himself.

It only remains to notice, that in virtue of the law in Christ's kingdom, by which all his people are vitally united to him, and have, in a measure, every gift and property which belongs to him, sincere believers are priests after the same form and pattern with himself. Chosen in him before the foundation of the world, consecrated by the sprinkling of his blood on their consciences, and the unction of his Spirit, and brought near to God, they are "a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." It is their privilege to go nigh through him, even into the holiest of all, and minister and serve before him as sons and daughters in his kingdom. And as in their Great Head, so in them the priestly calling stands related to the prophetical office on the one hand, and to the kingly on the other. As those who are privileged to stand so high and come so near to God, they obtain the "unction which teaches them all things"—"leads them into all the truth," makes them "children of light," and constitutes them "lights of the world." And the same Spirit, which is thus given to them as a spirit of wisdom and revelation, also rests on them as a spirit of power, and renders them "a royal priesthood;" even now, in a measure, they reign as kings over the evil in their natures, and in the world around them; and when Christ's work in them is brought to its proper consummation, they shall, as

kings and priests, share with him in the glories of his everlasting kingdom.

Hence, in the Christian priesthood, as well as in the Jewish, every thing in the first instance depends upon the condition of the person. It is not the offering that makes the priest, but the priest that makes the offering. He only, who has attained to a state of peace and fellowship with God, that is, he who has been regenerated by divine grace, and brought to a personal interest in the blessings of Christ's salvation, he alone is in a capacity for presenting to God the spiritual sacrifices of the New Testament. For what are these sacrifices? They are the fruits of grace, yielded by a soul that has become truly alive to God; and simply consist in the person's willing and active consecration of himself, through the varied exercises of love to God and his fellow-men. It is only, therefore, in so far as he is already a subject of grace, standing on the floor of Christ's perfected redemption, and replenished with the life-giving influences of the Holy Spirit, that his good deeds possess the character of sacrifices, acceptable to God; they are, otherwise, but dead works, of no account in the sight of Heaven, because proceeding from unclean hands, from persons unsanctified; and even though formally right, they still rank among the things of which God declares, that he has not required them at men's hands. (Isa. i. 12; Hag. ii. 10—13, where the state of the person is expressly affirmed to determine whatever it handles or does.)

But, on the other hand, those who are truly in the spiritual condition now described, have for themselves and their offerings free access to God in their own persons, at all times; and let no man spoil them of their birth-right. Chosen, as they are, in Christ, and constituted in him a royal priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, to place any others as priests between them and Christ, were to traverse the order and subvert the arrangements of God; it were to block up anew the path into the Holiest, which Christ has laid clearly open; to degrade those whom he has called to glory and virtue, to dishonour and deny Christ himself, the living root out of which his people grow, in whose life they live, and in whose acceptance they are accepted. A priesthood in the strict and proper sense, apart from what belongs to believers as such, can have no place in the New Testament church; and the institution of a distinct priestly order, such as exists in the Greek and Roman churches, is an unlawful usurpation, proceeding from the spirit of error and of antichrist. In such a kingdom as Christ's, where every real member is a priest, there can be room only for ministerial functions; which are required in this, as in every community, for the maintenance of order and the promotion of mutual edification. But in spiritual privilege, there can be no essential difference, since all have access to God by faith, through the grace wherein they stand and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DIVISION OF THE TABERNACLE INTO TWO APARTMENTS—THE FORE-COURT WITH ITS LAVER AND ALTAR OF SACRIFICE—THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEA OF SACRIFICE BY BLOOD, AND THE IMPORT OF THE THREE MAIN POINTS CONNECTED WITH IT, VIZ., THE CHOICE OF THE VICTIMS, THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS, AND THE SPRINKLING OF THE BLOOD.

In the preceding chapter we have considered the tabernacle and its officiating priesthood only in a general point of view, with reference simply to the great design of the one, and the distinctive character and privileges of the other. But we must now descend more into particulars; and endeavour to ascertain what was the precise import of its several parts, and of the services in connexion with these, which the priests were appointed to discharge. It is here so important to have a sure foundation laid, and the landmarks well fixed for future explanations, that we must in the present chapter confine our attention to what may be called a general survey of the particulars, the relation which one part bore to another, and the connexion in which the whole stood to the most essential part of the Old Testament worship—the rite of sacrifice. This will, of course, lead us to inquire into the exact nature of a sacrifice, and the import of the actions connected with it—those, especially, of the imposition of hands on the victim, and the sprinkling of its shed blood.

1. We look first to the tabernacle itself, which though one dwelling, presents itself to our view as divided into two compartments. By a richly embroidered curtain or vail, suspended from top to bottom, the innermost portion, consisting of ten cubits square, was cut off from the outer; and was designated "the Most Holy Place," while the other was simply called "the Sanctuary," or the Holy Place. Why should such a division have been formed—a division into two and only two apartments? A reason very naturally suggests itself for this in the general character and design of the erection. It was the Lord's dwelling-place; not as in a state of isolation, however, but as the symbol of his presence among his people, and the medium of intercourse between them and him; at once, therefore, God's and the people's dwelling—*the tent of meeting.* But however near God may come to his creatures, and however close the fellowship to which he admits them, there must still be something to mark his incomparable greatness and glory. Even in the sanctuary above, where all is stainless purity, the ministering angels, we are told, veil their faces with their wings before the manifested glory of Godhead; and how much more should sinful men on earth be conscious of his awful majesty, and their unfitness to stand amid the splendours of his throne? If, therefore, he should so far condescend as to pitch among them a tent for his

dwelling, we might certainly have expected that it would consist of two apartments—one which he would reserve for his own peculiar residence, and another to which they should have free access, who, as his familiars, were to be permitted to dwell with him in his house. For in this way alone could the two grand ideas of the glorious majesty of God, which raises him infinitely above his people, and yet of his covenant-nearness to them, be reconciled and represented together.

Besides, this tabernacle for the Lord's house, being the centre of a symbolical religion, must be itself the pattern of the whole kingdom to which the religion belonged. It was constructed so as to embody and express the principles of truth and holiness, on which God's connexion and intercourse with his people was to be maintained. And in this respect also a twofold division was obviously required, as the instruction to be afforded naturally fell into two parts—what concerned the relation of God to his people, and what concerned the people's relation to God. The necessities of the case required this, and we may certainly conclude, the plan actually adopted was formed with the design of securing it. The most holy place—the peculiar region of the divine presence and glory—with its furniture and service, represented what God was to his people, how and on what terms he would dwell among them and hold converse with them. The Sanctuary, which was assigned to the priests, the people's representatives, in like manner represented by means of its furniture and services, what it behooved them to be and do as admitted so near to God, with what divine graces they should be replenished, and with what fruits of righteousness they should abound. Thus, in the symbolical structure of the tabernacle, were to be seen the two great branches into which the tree of divine knowledge always of necessity falls, viz., the things to be believed concerning God, and the things to be done by his believing people. Had this been understood and kept properly in view, it would have prevented many false interpretations, and much inextricable confusion.*

2. It is obvious, however, that while the tabernacle was thus fitted, by means of its two apartments, to give a just representation of the relations between God and his people—and while the people at large could not be permitted to enter its courts on account of its peculiar sacredness, a place connected with it was still needed, where they might personally appear before God, and hold communion with him as locally present among them. For this pur-

* The right view here was first distinctly brought out by Hengstenberg, against Baehr, Authen. ii. p. 635, and has been since adopted also by Tholuck in the last edition of his Com. on Heb. ch. ix. 5. The typical explanations prevalent in the Cocceian school, and still current in this country, overlooked this distinction as a whole; although still the view taken of particular parts and services is often correct in the main. The error chiefly discovers itself in the interpretation given of the things belonging to the *Sanctuary*, in which Christ is commonly found as directly represented as in those of the Most Holy Place. See, for example, among the last works on the subject, Mudge's Tabernacle of Moses, which, not less than the older ones in this country, fails to draw the proper line of demarkation between the two apartments.

pose a space was marked off around the tabernacle, a hundred cubits long by fifty broad (about 150 feet by 75,) called the fore-court, or simply the court of the tabernacle. It was enclosed by curtains made of fine white twined linen, of the height of five cubits, (about 7½ feet.) These curtains were suspended from rods of silver, which reached from one column to another: the columns being of brass, (20 on each side and 10 at each end,) supported also on bases of brass, and having near the top silver hooks, in which the rods that sustained the hooks were inserted. The door-way into this fore-court, as into the tabernacle itself, was by a vail or curtain, which was drawn up with cords, as often as any one had occasion to enter. That any worshipping Israelite might enter, though not expressly said, is yet evidently implied; and according to Jewish authority, it was absolutely essential that one part of the service in every blood-sacrifice—the imposition of the offerer's hands upon the victim—should take place within the court. And in the more complete and ample accommodations connected with the temple, not only was the court of Israel within the sacred enclosure, and commanded a full view of the services about the altar, but the worshippers who had sacrifices to offer, were wont to go even into the court of the priests and lay their hands upon the victim.

This court of the tabernacle was furnished with two articles of worship, the laver and the altar of burnt-offering; both of which stood in a close and intimate connexion with the tabernacle itself and its most peculiar services. The laver, a kind of basin, or vessel of brass, nowhere exactly described, but supposed to have been of a circular shape, and standing on a foot or base of brass, was placed between the altar and the tabernacle, as the most convenient position, its design being to provide a ready supply of water, with which the priests were to wash their hands and their feet, before ministering at the altar on the one hand, or going into the tabernacle on the other. "When they go into the tabernacle of meeting they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the tabernacle to minister, to burn offerings made by fire unto the Lord," (Ex. xxx. 20.) That merely the hands and the feet of the officiating priests were to be washed at this laver, arose simply from these being the parts of their bodies immediately employed in their sacred ministrations—their hands, when engaged in presenting the sacrifices upon the altar, their feet, when going to tread the floor of the sanctuary. The strict injunction to have these acting members washed beforehand, denoted the personal holiness with which the work of God must be performed, and which is the ultimate aim, indeed, of all the institutions of worship. As the sanctification or holiness of Israel was the object of the services connected with the altar and the sanctuary, it was absolutely necessary, that they who did the service should appear to be in a state of personal cleanness. The Psalmist clearly indicates the meaning of the rite, and shows also, that in the spirit of a true Israelite he regarded it as not less applicable to himself than to

the priests, when he said, "I will wash mine hands in innocency, *so* will I compass thine altar, O Lord," (xxvi. 6.) And that this washing in his view had respect to an internal purification, is evident from the whole tenor of the Psalm, which speaks throughout of moral cleanness and impurity, and especially from the preceding verses, in which the Psalmist declares his separation from "the wicked," "evil-doers," and "dissemblers," and even entreats God to "try his reins and his heart." So also in Ps. xxvi., he points from the symbol to its spiritual import, when he asks, "Who shall ascend into the hill of God, or who shall stand in his holy place?" And answers by saying, "He that hath clean hands and a pure heart."*

The symbol here employed is of so natural a kind, and so fitly adapted for conveying spiritual instruction to all ages of the church, that it has been to some extent retained also in the New Testament dispensation,—in the rite of baptism. For, however administered, whether by immersing, washing, or sprinkling, there can be no question that the cleansing nature of the element is the ground out of which the ordinance rises, and from which it derives its appropriate character, as the initiatory service of a Christian life.

* Some difference of opinion still prevails regarding the meaning of the passage, in which the making of the original laver is described, Ex. xxxviii. 8. In the authorized version it is: "And he made the laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the looking-glasses of the women assembling, which assembled at the foot of the tabernacle of the congregation." Baehr, following Fort. Sacchus, understands the looking-glasses, not of the materials of which it was made, but of the furniture with which it was provided: he provided it with looking-glasses for the women, &c. His chief reason for this is a grammatical one; viz., that the verb עשה (to make,) has the substance out of which the thing is made always in the accusative, without any preposition prefixed, and that, therefore, the preposition before the looking-glasses (ב) must be taken in the sense of *with*. If the learned author had only examined the concluding verses of this very chapter, he could not have made such an assertion; for in v. 30, speaking of what was done with the brass of the offering, it is said, "And therewith, or thereof, he made the sockets," (ויעש בה.) Besides, what were women going to do with looking-glasses in connexion with the laver, or at the door of the tabernacle? Indeed, it is not conceivable that a place was assigned to any women in the neighbourhood of the laver, and close beside the door of the tabernacle, as no part of the ministrations about the tabernacle was committed to their charge. By the door of the tabernacle here, and in 1 Sam. ii. 22, we should suppose, must be meant the door of the court of the tabernacle, corresponding to the court of the women in the temple, which was at a still greater distance than that of the men from the entrance into the temple. It would appear, however, that even so early as the construction of the tabernacle, there was a company of pious women dedicating themselves to constant attendance on the worship of God, and having a place assigned them in connexion with the tabernacle. Their special duties of service seem to have been fasting and prayer. The lxx. on this account, interpreting rather than rendering the meaning of the original, have, "of the looking-glasses of the fasting-women, who fasted." And Abenezra, as quoted by Lightfoot (Op. i. p. 643,) gives the following explanation of the matter: "It is the custom of all women to behold their face every morning in a mirror, that they may be able to dress their hair, but lo! there were women in Israel who served the Lord, abandoning this earthly sort of pleasure, and yielding up their mirrors as voluntary oblations; nor did they any longer need these, but daily came to the door of the tabernacle to pray, and hear the words of the law." In later times, Anna was evidently one of these priest-like females, "departing not from the temple, but serving God with fastings and prayers night and day." (Luke ii. 37, comp. also 1 Tim. v. 5.) The latter part of Ex. xxxviii. 8, should run, "Of the serving-women who served at the gate of the tabernacle of the congregation." The expression in the original has respect properly to military service, but is also often used of the stated services of the priests, Numb. iv. 23, 35, 49; viii. 25.

Symbolically, it conveys the salutary instruction, that he who becomes Christ's, and through Christ would dedicate himself to the work and service of God, must be purified from the filth and pollution of sin; he must be regenerated and made holy. Believers are therefore described as "having their bodies washed with pure water," (Heb. x. 22, where the symbolical language is still entirely retained,) as having undergone "the washing of regeneration," (Tit. iii. 5, where the internal character of the work is distinctly intimated, and also coupled with the efficient cause in the additional expression, "the renewing of the Holy Ghost,") or again, as being "sanctified and cleansed by the washing of water, by the word," (Eph. v. 26,)—by the word, namely the word of truth, for this received into the heart and made effectual to salvation, is internally the means of cleansing, is the instrumental cause through which the spiritual sanctification is accomplished. So that he who would acceptably approach God and discharge aright the duties of his service, must first have his heart purified by faith, dwelling in the light, and through the light, participating in the holiness of God. The unclean, those who are still living in the guilt and pollution of sin, can have no standing in his kingdom, and even "their prayers are abomination to him." As Aaron had the sentence of death suspended over him, in case he should go about his ministration with unwashed hands or feet, so the devotions of such, instead of securing the blessing of God, only provoke the eyes of his glory, and expose them the more to his condemnation.

But the other piece of sacred furniture belonging to the forecourt, the altar of burnt-offering, had in some respects a still closer connexion with the interior of the tabernacle and its holy ministrations. For it was with live coals taken from it, that the priest constantly furnished his censer when he went in to burn incense before the Lord, and only after being himself sprinkled with blood from that altar could he go into the tabernacle and perform the service of God. On these accounts, and also because it was the one altar of sacrifice, where the people could directly meet with God and present to him their offerings, the altar of burnt-offering held a place of peculiar importance. It was directed to be made of boards of shittim-wood, covered with brass; and of this latter material also were made the several instruments attached to it—pans, shovels, flesh-hooks, &c. Hence, it is frequently called the *brazen* altar, to distinguish it from the altar of incense within the tabernacle, which, from having been overlaid with gold, is sometimes named the *golden* altar. In form, it was a square of five cubits, and about four feet and a half high, with what were called *horns*, or projecting corners. Its ever-burning fire-place consisted of a moveable grate, sunk down from the top in the centre, suspended by four rings, so that the fire was at some distance from the boards of the altar, there being a space between these, and the grating of net-work, which held the fire—"hollow with boards shalt thou make it." And this hollow space is justly supposed to have been left for being filled with earth or stones, so that the brazen

altar might still answer the description given in Ex. xx. 24, 25, "An altar of earth shalt thou make me, and if thou wilt make it of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone."* The reason of which is to be sought, not in any repudiation of external pomp or splendour in the divine worship, which would have placed the altar in direct contrast to many things in the tabernacle, nor in the intention of meeting certain idolatrous tendencies (as Spencer represents,) but in the proper nature and design of the altar itself.

For, this altar of sacrifice was to be the grand point of meeting between God and sinful men, between God and men *as sinful;* and only by first meeting there, and entering into a state of reconciliation and peace, could they afterwards be admitted into his house, as those who had the privilege of communion and fellowship with him. The altar was in a sense God's table in a sinful world, at and around which, the Holy One of heaven and the guilty children of dust might meet in friendly contact. But as such it must be a table peculiarly of blood, the place for things killed and slaughtered (hence called המזבח from זבח to kill or slaughter,) for the way to fellowship with God, for guilty beings, could only be found through an avenue of death. And since this table must thus perpetually bear on it the deadly memorials and fruits of sin, what so suitable for the materials, of which it was to be principally formed, as the naked dust of earth, or earth's unhewn, unpolished stones, taken just as God and nature brought them to their hand? For thus the worshippers might most easily discern the appointed place of meeting to be of God's providing, and his in such a sense, that no art or device of theirs could be of any avail to fit it for the high end it was intended to serve, nay, that their workmanship, being that of sinful creatures, had rather a contrary tendency, a polluting effect. Materials directly fashioned by the hand of God were alone suitable here, and these not of the more rare and costly description, but the simple earth, made originally for man's support and nourishment, but now the witness of his sin, the drinker in of the blood of his forfeited life, the theatre and home of death.

This altar, then, being in a manner God's table, what was properly God's part, and especially what he required as the means of atonement and reconciliation for sin, fell to be presented there. Even though not consumed, all of this nature had still to be offered, and as it were, served up on it. But the things which God claimed as peculiarly his own were also consumed; and the element, which was employed for this purpose, was the flaming fire, which is the

* Spencer (De Leg. L. ii. c. 6,) conceives this altar to have been such only as was to be raised on extraordinary occasions, and not to apply at all to the brazen altar. Some of the Jewish writers, however, judge better: "Altare terreum est hoc ipsum æneum altare, cujus concavum terra implebatur."—Jarchi on Ex. xxvii. 5; "Cavitas vero altaris terra replebatur, quo tempore castra, ponebant."—Bechai in ib. And Baehr properly remarks, after Von Meyer, that this hollow space was not merely to be thus filled up with earth or stones, but that so filled, it formed the most essential and distinctive part of the materials of the altar—the boards being chiefly intended as a form or casing to hold it together. Hence also, that the earthen matter might appear prominent, the brazen altar was to have no covering or top, like the altar of incense.

most fitting representative of a holy God—and fire, not as lighted up by the hand of man, but sent down directly from above, to make it the more clearly indicative of his divine nature. For the fire, which fell from heaven at the first institution of the tabernacle-service, and consumed the burnt-offering and the fat (Lev. ix. 24,) it was the part of the priesthood to keep perpetually burning; so that the same fire of heaven, in a manner, continually consumed the people's offerings, in token of their acceptance by God, while he not only spared, but blessed those who presented them.*

3. From what has been said, we are prepared to understand, that what most of all gave to this altar its distinctive character, rendered it available to the grand purpose of reconciliation, for which it was erected, was its being on all ordinary occasions the one place for presenting before God the blood of slain victims. This was the principal thing, and whatever else was ordered to be done in connexion with it, could only be regarded as subordinate and accessory. And the reason is given by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, when he testifies, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins," consequently no peace or fellowship with God for the sinner. It is still more fully brought out, however, in a declaration of Moses himself, the precise import and bearing of which deserves the most careful consideration. The passage is in Lev. xvii. 11, which should be rendered, not as in our version, but with Baehr; "For the soul (נפש) of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to atone for your souls, for the blood atones through the soul." (בנפש.) It is scarcely possible to mistake the general sense of this important passage, but its precise and definite meaning has been somewhat obscured, by not perceiving that the *soul* at the close of the verse refers back to the *soul* at the beginning, and indicates the principle or seat of life, not in him who is to be atoned for, but in the creature by which the atonement is made for him. And the full and correct import of the passage is to the following effect: "You must not eat the blood, because God has appointed it as the means of atonement for your sins. But it is the means of atonement, as the bearer of the soul. It is not therefore the matter of the blood that atones, but the soul or life, which resides in it; so that the soul of the offered victim atones for the soul of the man who offers it."†

* Lev. vi. 12, 13. We think Vitringa wrong in making the altar represent directly God himself, (Com. on Isa. vi. 6, but he says excellently concerning the fire: "The fire upon the altar signifies any thing in God, and, indeed, *what is holy in God*—either the holy will of God, righteous, loving excellence, delighting in every good work, and vindicating his own glory; or the Holy Spirit of God, which is in God and from God, himself holy and the administrator of the dispensation of holiness."—The Lord also had a table in the sanctuary what was called by that name—the table of show-bread; but one that indicated, as we shall see, a very different relation between God and the worshippers, and might be justly regarded as a table in the ordinary sense. Compare further in proof of the view given above, Mal. i. 12; 1 Cor. x. 17, 21; Heb. xiii. 10.

† The passage, indeed, is intended simply to provide an answer to two questions: Why they should not eat blood? viz., because the blood was appointed by God for making atonement. And, why blood should have been appointed for this purpose? viz., because the soul or life is there, and hence is most suitably taken for the soul or life

The ground upon which this merciful arrangement plainly proceeds is the doomed condition of men as sinners, and the purpose of God to save them from its infliction. Their soul or life, has, through sin, been forfeited to God, and, as a debt due to his justice, it should in right be rendered back again to Him who gave it. The enforcement of this claim, of course, inevitably involves the death of transgressors, according to the sentence from the very first hung over the commission of sin, denouncing its penalty to be death. But as God appears in the institution of sacrifice providing a way of escape from this deserved doom, he mercifully appoints a substitute—the soul or life of a beast, for the soul or life of the transgressor; and as the seat of life is in the blood, so the blood of the beast, its life-blood, was given to be shed in death, and served up on the altar of God, in the room of that other higher, but guilty life, which had become due to divine justice. When this was done, when the blood of the slain victim was poured out or sprinkled upon the altar, and thereby given up to God, the sinner's guilt was atoned (covered;) a screen, as it were, was thrown between the eye of God and his guilt, or between his own soul and the penalty due to his transgression. In other words, a life that had not been forfeited was accepted in the room of his own, which *was* forfeited; and this was yielded back to him as now again a life in peace and fellowship with God—a life out of death.

It is clear, however, that while in one respect the life or soul of the sacrifice was a suitable offering or atonement for that of the sinner, as being unstained by guilt, innocent; in another, it was entirely the reverse, and could not in any proper and satisfactory sense take away sin. This imperfection or inadequacy arose from the vast disproportion between the two—the one soul being that of a rational and accountable creature, free to think and act, to determine and choose for itself, the other that of an irrational creature, destitute of independent thought and moral feeling, and so incapable alike of sin or of holiness. It is, therefore, only in a negative sense that the sacrificed victim could be regarded even as innocent; for, strictly speaking, the question of guilt or innocence belongs to a higher region than that which, by the very law of its being, it was appointed to occupy. And being thus so inferior in nature, how far was it from possessing what yet the least reflection could easily discern to be necessary to constitute a real and valid atonement or covering for the sinner's deficiency, viz. an equivalent for his life. The life-blood, then, which God gave for

of man forfeited by sin. The sense and connexion of the passage is so clear when thus stated, that nothing need be said in confirmation of it. Baehr, however, has the merit of fully bringing it out, and establishing it grammatically on a solid foundation. Abenezra, quoted by Baehr, had briefly indicated the right interpretation: "Sanguis animâ, quæ sibi inest, expiat;" also Gussetius: "Per animam, i. e., vi animæ in eo sanguine constantis." The service rendered by Baehr, however, in this respect, has been unhappily more than neutralized, by the misapplication of this passage, which he has laboriously striven to make, in support of his own false views of atonement. We shall throw into the form of an appendix to this chapter an examination of his grounds, and shall chiefly meet his erroneous statements by correct ones, as urged by an opponent in his own country—Kurtz, in his Mosaische Opfer.

this purpose upon the altar, must obviously have been but a temporary expedient; his offended holiness could not rest in that, nor could he have intended more by the appointment than the keeping up of a present testimony for the higher satisfaction, which justice demanded for the sinner's guilt, and a symbolical representation of it. Then, out of these radical defects there inevitably arose others, which still farther marked with imperfection and inadequacy the sacrifices of irrational victims. For here there was necessarily wanting that oneness of nature between the sinner and his substitute, and in the latter that consent of will to the mutual interchange of parts, which are indispensably requisite to the idea of a perfect sacrifice. Nor could the sacrifice itself—which was a still more palpable incongruity—be, like the sin, for which it was offered in atonement, a voluntary and personal act; the priest and the sacrifice were of necessity divided, and the work of atonement was done, not *by* the victim in willing self-dedication, but *upon* it, all unconsciously, by the hand of another.

Such defects and imperfections inhering in the very nature of ancient sacrifice, it could not possibly have been introduced or sanctioned by God as a satisfactory and ultimate arrangement. Nor could he have adopted it even as a temporary one, so far as to warrant the Israelitish worshipper to look for pardon and acceptance by complying with its enactments, unless there had already been provided in his eternal counsels, to be in due time manifested to the world, a real and adequate sacrifice for human guilt. Such a sacrifice, we need scarcely add, is to be found in Christ; who is, therefore, called emphatically "the Lamb of God"—"the lamb slain from the foundation of the world"—and of whose precious blood it is written that "it cleanseth from all sin."

How far, however, the Jewish worshippers themselves were alive to the necessity of this alone adequate provision, and realized the certainty of its future manifestation, can only be matter of probable conjecture, or reasonable inference. As the light of the church, generally, differed at different times, and in different individuals, so undoubtedly would the apprehension of this portion of divine truth have its diversities of comparative clearness and obscurity in the Jewish mind. If there were faith only to the extent of embracing and acting upon the existing arrangements—faith to present the appointed sacrifices for sin, and to believe, in humble confidence, that imperfect and defective as these manifestly were, they would still be accepted for an atonement, and that God himself would know how to supply what his own provision needed to complete its efficacy—if faith only to this extent existed, we have no reason to say it was insufficient for salvation; it might be faith very much in the dark, but still it was faith in a revealed word of God, implicitly following the path which that word prescribed. It was the child relying on a father's goodness, and committing itself to the guidance of a father's wisdom, while still unable to see the end and reason of the course by which it was led.

But it was scarcely possible for thoughtful and reflective minds,

for any length of time at least, to stand simply at this point. The felt imperfection and deficiency in the appointed sacrifices could not fail in such minds to connect itself with the Messiah, with whose coming there was always associated the introduction of a state of order and perfection. Some even of the Rabbinical writers speak as expressly upon this point as the New Testament itself does.* And "when the conscience of the Israelite (to use the words of Kurtz) was fairly awakened to the insufficiency of the blood of irrational creatures to effect a real atonement for sin, there was no other way for him to obtain satisfaction, than in the supposition that a perfect ever available sacrifice lay in the future. This supposition was the more natural to him, and must have readily suggested itself, as the Israelite, according to his constitutional temperament, was 'a man of desire,' and was farther stimulated and encouraged by the whole genius and tendency of his religion to look forward to the future. Besides, his entire life and history, his ancestors, his land, his people, his law, all bore a typical character, which his own spiritual tendency prompted him to search for, and which antecedent divine revelations instructed him to find. . . . And had not Moses himself given plain indication of the typical character of the whole ritual introduced by him, when he testified that the eternal archetype of it was shown him upon the holy mount? How natural was it, moreover, to bring the heart and centre of the entire worship into connexion with the promises respecting the seed of the woman and of the patriarchs, and possibly with still other elements in the earlier revelations or devout breathings? How natural to connect together the centre of his expectations with the centre of his worship—to descry a secret, though still perhaps incomprehensible connexion between them, and in that to seek the explication of the sacred mystery?"†

4. The directions given in the law of Moses respecting the sacrificial blood, as well before as after its being shed in death, tend in every respect to confirm the views already exhibited of its vicarious import. They relate chiefly to the selection of the victims—the imposition of the offerer's hands on its head—and the action with (the sprinkling of) the blood.

* Schœttgen (Hor. Heb. et Tal. ii. p. 612) produces from Jewish authorities the following plain declarations: "In the times of the Messiah all sacrifices will cease, but the sacrifice of praise will not cease:" "When the Israelites were in the holy land, they took away all diseases and punishments from the world, through the acts of worship and the sacrifices which they performed; but now Messiah takes these away from the sons of men." One quoted by Baehr from Eisenmenger (Entdectes Judenthum, ii. p. 720) goes so far as to say, "that he would pour out his soul unto death, and that his blood would make atonement for the people of God."—It is right to state, however, that the value of such testimonies is greatly diminished by the multitude of directly opposite ones, which are also to be found in the Rabbinical writings. In the very next page, Schœttgen has passages affirming that the day of expiation should never cease, and the mass of the Jews in our Lord's time certainly believed in the perpetuity of the law of Moses. The utmost that can be fairly deduced from the quotations noticed above is, that there were minds among them seeking relief from felt wants and deficiencies, in the expectation of that more perfect state of things which was to brought in by Christ.

† Mosaische Opfer, p. 43, 44, comp. also what was said on this subject in the former vol. of Typology, p. 110–116.

1.) The choice in respect to the victims to be offered was limited to "the herd and the flocks" (oxen, sheep, and goats,) and to individuals of these without any manifest blemish. Why animals from such classes alone were to be taken, was already indicated briefly but correctly by Witsius,* when treating of the connexion between the restriction as to clean animals for food, and the appointment of the same for sacrifice upon the altar: "God wished (says he) these two to be joined together, partly that man might thereby exhibit the more clearly his gratitude to God, in offering what had been given him for the support of his own life; and partly, that the substitution of the sacrifice in his stead might be rendered the more palpable. For man offering the support of his own life, appeared to offer that life itself." This last thought, we have no doubt, indicates what may be called the primary reason, and brings the selection of the victim into closest contact with the essential nature of the sacrifice. It was not permitted to offer in sacrifice human victims, because none such could be found free from guilt, and so were utterly unfit for being presented as a substitution for sinful men. But to make the gap as small as possible between the offerer and the victim—to secure that at least the animal natures of the two should stand in the nearest relation, the offerer was obliged to select his representative from the tame domestic animals of his own property and of his own rearing, the most *human* in their natural disposition and mode of life; and not only that, but such also as might in a certain sense be regarded as of one flesh with himself—so far homogeneous, that the flesh of the one was fit for nutriment for the flesh of the other. The principle which lay at the bottom of this selection, like every other in the ancient economy, is seen rising to its perfect form and highest manifestation in Christ—who, while the eternal Son of God, and as such infinitely exalted above man, yet brought himself down to man's sphere, became literally flesh of man's flesh, and, sin alone excepted, was found in all things like to man, that he might be a suitable offering, as well as High-priest, for the heirs of his salvation.†

It was for a reason very closely related to the one noticed, that the particular animal offered in sacrifice was to be always perfect in its kind. In the region of the animal life it was to be a fitting representative of what man should be—what his real and proper representative *must* be, in the region of the moral and spiritual life.

* Miscel. Sac. Lib. ii. Diss. 2, § 14.

† The reasons often given for the choice of the victims being confined to the flock and the herd, such as that, these were the more valuable, were more accessible, ever at hand, horned (emblematical of power and dignity,) and such like, fall away of themselves, when the subject is viewed in its deeper connexion and bearings. It is, of course, quite easy to find many analogies in such respects between the victims and Christ; but they are rather beside the purpose, and tend to lead away the mind from the main idea. The view of Baehr is just an ingenious and plausible modification of the notion, which represents the materials of ancient sacrifice as property-gifts; oxen, sheep, and goats, were the pastoral, as bread, oil, and wine, the agricultural products of the land—so that the things sacrificed were representatives of the people's whole property. The view is radically defective, for it omits all reference to sin, punishment, substitution, the prime elements in ancient sacrifice.

Any palpable defect or blemish, rendering it an imperfect specimen of the natural species it belonged to, would have visibly marred the image it was intended to present of the holy beauty which was sought by God first in man, and now in man's substitute and ransom. For the reality we are again pointed by the inspired writers of the New Testament to Christ, whose blood is described as that "of a lamb without blemish, and without spot," and who is declared to have been such a High-priest as became us, because "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners."

In cases of extreme poverty, when the worshipper could not afford a proper sacrifice, the law permitted him to bring pigeons or turtle-doves, the blood of which was to be brought to the altar as that of the animal victim. That these rather than poultry are specified, the domestic fowls of modern times, arose from the manners prevalent among the ancient Israelites. These doves were in fact with them the tame, domesticated fowls, and in the feathered tribe corresponded to sheep and oxen among animals. No mention is made of home-bred fowls or chickens in Old Testament scripture.

(2.) The second leading prescription regarding the victim, viz. that before having its blood shed in death, the offerer should lay his hand or hands upon its head, was still more essentially connected with the great idea of sacrifice. This imposition of hands was common to all the bloody sacrifices, and is given as a general direction before each of the several kinds of them, except the trespass-offering (Lev. i. 4; iii. 2; iv. 4–15; xvi. 21; 1 Chron. xxix. 23,) and was no doubt omitted in regard to it on account of its being so much of the same nature with the sin-offering, that the regulation would naturally be understood to be applicable to both. There can be no question that the Jewish writers held the necessity of the imposition of hands in all the animal sacrifices except the passover.* What the rite really imported would be easily determined, if the explanation were sought merely from the materials furnished by Scripture itself. There the custom, viewed generally, appears as a symbolical action, indicating the communication of something in the person who imposes his hands, to the person or being on whom they are imposed. Hence it was used on such occasions as the bestowal of blessing (Gen. xlviii. 13; Matth. xix. 15;) and the communication of the Holy Spirit, whether to heal bodily disease (Matth. ix. 18; Mark vi. 5; Acts ix. 12–17, &c.,) or to endow with supernatural gifts (Acts xix. 6,) or to designate or qualify for a sacred office (Numb. xxvii. 18; Acts vi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22.) In all such cases there was plainly a conveyance to one who wanted from another who possessed, and the hand, the usual instrument of communication in the matter of gifts, simply denoted,

* Omnibus victimis, quæ a quopiam privato offerebantur, sive ex præcepto, sive ex arbitrio offerentur, oportebat ipsum imponere manus dum vivebant adhuc, exceptis tantum primitiis, decimis, et agno paschali. Maimon. Hilc. Korbanoth 3. See also Outram, De Sac. L. i. c. 15; Ainsworth on Lev. i. 4; xvi. 6, 11; Magee on Atonement, Note 39.

when laid upon the head of the recipient, the fact of the conveyance being actually made. What, then, in the case of the bloody sacrifices did the offerer possess which did not belong to the victim? What had the one to convey to the other? Primarily and chiefly guilt. This, as we have already shown, was the grand and fundamental distinction between the offerer and his victim; it was specially, as being the representative of him in his state of guilt and condemnation, that its blood required to be shed in death, to pay the wages of his sin; and as God had given it to be used for such a purpose, so the offerer's laying his hands upon its head indicated that he willingly appropriated it to the same, and made over to it as innocent the burden of guilt with which he felt himself to be charged. Besides this, no doubt, other things in the offerer might also be symbolically transferred to the sacrifice, according to the special design and object of the sacrifice; as his substitute, presented to God in his room and stead, it might be made to embody and express whatever feelings toward God had a place in his bosom—not merely convictions of sin, and desires of forgiveness, but also such feelings as gratitude for benefits received, or humble confidence in the divine mercy and loving-kindness. And in the case, for example, of peace or thank-offerings, it was the latter class of feelings rather than the former, which were directly and prominently expressed. But still by no means to the exclusion of the other. In whatever circumstances, and with whatever special design man may approach God, he must come as a sinner, conscious of his unworthiness and his guilt. Nor, if he comprehends aright the relation in which he naturally stands to God, will any thing tend more readily to awaken in his bosom this humble and contrite feeling, than a sensible participation of the mercies of God; for he will regard them as tokens of divine goodness, of which his sinfulness has made him altogether unworthy. So that the nearer God may have come to him in the riches of his grace, the more will he always be inclined to say with Jacob: "I am not worthy of all the mercies and the truth which thou hast shown unto thy servant;" or with the Psalmist: "Lord, what is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?" It was, therefore, of necessity that there should have been even in such offerings a sense of guilt and unworthiness on the part of the worshipper, and it was not an incongruous, but rather a becoming and proper arrangement, that the presentation of the sacrifice should be preceded by an act denoting the transference of his sense of guilt, as well as other appropriate feelings, to his representative.

It is impossible, then, we conceive, to separate in any case the imposition of hands on the head of the victim from the expression and conveyance of guilt; just because the worshipper could never approach God in any other character than that of a sinner, consequently in no other way than through the shedding of blood. The special service the blood had to render in all the sacrifices, was to be an atonement for the sinner's guilt upon the altar; and

in reference to that part of the victim—always the most essential part—the imposition of the offerer's hands was the expression of his desire to find deliverance through that blood from his burden of iniquity, and acceptance with God. In those offerings especially—such as sin and trespass-offerings—in which the feeling of sin was peculiarly prominent in the sinner's bosom, the outward ceremony would be used with so much the more of this respect to the imputation of guilt; the whole desire would concentrate itself here. And in perfect accordance with what has been said, we learn, from Jewish sources, that the imposition of hands was always accompanied with confession of sin, but this varying, as to the particular form it assumed, according to the nature of the sacrifice presented. And in the only explanation which Moses himself has given of the meaning of the rite, namely as connected with the services of the day of atonement, it is represented as being accompanied not only with confession of sin, but also with the sin's conveyance to the body of the victim: "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat.*"*

The principle involved in this transaction is equally applicable to New Testament times, and, stript of its external form, is simply this, that the atonement of Jesus becomes available to the salvation of the sinner, only when he comes to it with heartfelt convictions of sin, and with mingled sorrow and confidence disburdens himself there of the whole accumulation of his guilt. Repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ, must grow and work together, like twin sisters, in the experience of his soul. And assuredly, if there be no genuine sense of sin, showing itself in a readiness to make full confession of the shortcomings and transgressions in which it has appeared, and an earnest desire to turn from it and be delivered from its just condemnation through the blood of sprinkling, as there is no real preparedness of heart to

* Lev. xvi. 21. The Jewish authorities referred to may be seen in Outram, L. i. c. 15, § 10, 11; Ainsworth on Lev. i. 4; Magee, note 39. Upon the sin-offering the offerer confessed the iniquity of sin, upon the trespass-offering the iniquity of trespass, upon the burnt offering the iniquity of doing what he should not have done, and not doing what he ought, &c. Outram gives several forms of confession, of which we select merely the one for a private individual, when confessing with his hands on his sin-offering: "I beseech thee, O Lord, I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have rebelled, I have done so and so (mentioning the particular transgression;) but now I repent, and let this victim be my expiation." So closely was imposition of hands associated in Jewish minds with confession of sins, that it passed with them for a maxim, "Where there is no confession of sins there is no imposition of hands;" and they also held it equally certain, that the design of this imposition of hands "was to remove the sins from the individual and transfer them to the animal," (Outram, L. i. c. xv. 8; xxii. 5.) The circumstance of the hearers of blasphemy being appointed to lay their hands on the head of the blasphemer before he was stoned (Lev. xxiv. 14,) is no contradiction to what has been said, but rather a confirmation; for till the guilt was punished, it was looked upon as belonging to the congregation at large (comp. Jos. vii. 2 Sam. xxi.) and by this rite it was devolved entirely upon himself, that he might bear the punishment. Baehr finds nothing in the rite but a symbolical declaration that the victim was the offerer's own property, and that he was ready to devote it to death.

receive, so there can be no actual participation in the benefits of Christ's redemption.

(3.) The only remaining direction of a general kind, applicable to all the sacrifices of blood, was the action with the blood after it was shed. It was to be sprinkled—on ordinary occasions, upon the altar round about, but on the day of atonement, also upon the mercy-seat in the inner, and the altar of incense in the outer apartment of the Tabernacle. For the present, we confine our attention to the ordinary use of it. "This sprinkling of the blood," Outram remarks, "was by much the most sacred part of the entire service, since it was that by which the life and soul of the victim were considered to be given to God as supreme Lord of life and death; for what was placed upon the altar of God was supposed, according to the religion of the Old Testament, to be rendered to him."* But in what relation did the blood stand, when thus rendered to God? Was it as still charged with the guilt of the offerer, and underlying the sentence of God's righteous condemnation? So the language just quoted would seem to import. But how then meet the objection, which naturally arises on such a supposition, that a polluted thing was laid upon the altar of God? And how could the blood with propriety be regarded as so holy when sprinkled on the altar, that it sanctified whatever it touched? We present the following as in our judgment the true representation of the matter: By the offerer's bringing his victim, and with imposition of hands confessing over it his sins, it became symbolically a personation of sin, and hence must forthwith bear the penalty of sin—death. When this was done, the offerer was himself free alike from sin and from its penalty. But was the transaction by which this was effected owned by God? And was the offerer again restored, as one possessed of pure and blessed life, to the favour and fellowship of God? It was to indicate these things—the most important in the whole transaction—that the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar took place. Having with his own hands executed the deserved penalty on the victim, the offerer gave the blood to the priest, as God's representative. But that blood had already paid, in death, the penalty of sin, and was no longer laden with guilt and pollution. The justice of God was (symbolically) satisfied concerning it; and by the hands of his own representative, he could with perfect consistence receive it, as a pure and spotless thing, the very image of his own holiness, upon his table or altar. In being received there, however, it still represented the blood or soul of the offerer, who thus saw himself, through the action with the blood of his victim, re-established in communion with God, and solemnly recognised as possessing life, holy and blessed, as it is in God himself. His soul had come again into peaceful and approved contact with God, and was thence admitted to participate of a divine nature.†

* De Sac. L. I. c. 16, § 4.

† This representation, which is so perfectly simple, that it cannot be regarded as having lain beyond the reach of the commonest worshipper, completely disposes of

How exactly this representation accords with what is written of Christ, must be obvious on the slightest reflection. When dying as man's substitute and representative, he appeared laden with the guilt of innumerable sins, as one who, though he knew no sin, yet had "been made sin," bearing concentrated in his person the mass of his people's pollution; and on this account he received upon his head the curse due to sin, sank under the stroke of death, as an outcast from heaven, the vilest of the vile. But the moment he gave up the ghost an end was made of sin; with the pouring out of his soul unto death, its guilt and curse were exhausted for all who should be heirs of salvation: Godhead was glorified concerning it with a perfect glory; and when the life laid down in ignominy and shame was again resumed in honour and triumph, and this, or the blood in which it resided, was presented before the Father in the heavenly places, it bespoke his people's acceptance in him to the possession of the life out of death, to nearest fellowship with God, and the perpetual enjoyment of the divine favour; so that they are even said to "sit with him in heavenly places," and to have "their life hid with Christ in God." Hence also the peculiar force and significancy of the expression in 1 Pet. i. 2, so generally misunderstood, "unto," not only obedience, but also "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus;" which literally means the participation of his risen, divine, heavenly life—a life that is full of the favour and purity and blessedness of God. It is there spoken of as the end and consummation of a Christian calling. Not as if such a calling could really be entered upon without an interest in Christ's risen life; but there must be a growing participation; and the spiritual life of a child of God approaches to perfection, according as he becomes "complete in Jesus," and is through him "filled into the fulness of God."

But we need not enter here more at length into the elucidation of the truth, as it will again occur, especially in connexion with the service of the day of atonement; and for a fuller illustration of the passage just alluded to, we refer to the former volume (p. 154–6.) The sprinkling was there viewed with a more special reference to the service at the ratification of the covenant, when the blood was partly sprinkled on the altar, and partly on the people, to denote more distinctly their participation and fellowship in what belonged to it. In the case of ordinary sacrifices, however, this was not done; nor could it be said to be necessary to complete the symbolical action. The offerer, after having brought his victim to the altar, laid his hands on its head with confession of sin, and having solemnly given it up for his expiation, could have no difficulty in realizing his connexion with the blood, and

the objection urged by Sykes, Priestley, and others, that if the guilt of the offerer was laid upon the victim, men must have offered to God what was polluted. The objection was taken up, but in its main point rather evaded than satisfactorily answered by Magee in his 30th note. Kurtz has come the nearest to a right explanation of this part of the sacrificial idea (Mos. Opfer. p. 80–85,) but spoils its simplicity and truthfulness by considering the altar as in a sense representative of the offerer.

his interest in its future application. The difficulty rather stood in his realizing God's acceptance of such blood in his behalf, and on its account restoring him to life and blessing. Now, however, the difficulty is entirely on the other side, and stands in realizing, not the acceptance of Christ's soul or blood by the Father, but our personal interest in it—in apprehending ourselves to be really and truly represented in the pouring out of his soul for sin, and its presentation for acceptance and blessing in the heavenly places. Hence, while respect is also had to the former in the New Testament, yet in the practical application of the doctrine of redemption, the latter is commonly made more prominent—viz., "the sprinkling of the believer's heart," or "the purging of his conscience," with the blood of Jesus. This is done, however, simply out of respect to the difficulty referred to; and, stript of their symbolical colouring, the essential and radical idea in all such representations is, God's owning in the behalf of his people, and receiving into fellowship with himself, as pure and holy, that life which has borne in death the penalty of sin; so that its new, undying life becomes their life, and its inheritance of blessing their inheritance. That owning and receiving on the part of God is what is meant by Christ's sprinkling with his blood the heavenly places; and to realize on solid grounds the fact of its having been done *for us*, is on our part to come to the blood of sprinkling, and enter into the participation of its pure and blessed life.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV.

ON BAEHR'S VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

The doctrine which this learned author seeks to establish, and mainly grounds upon Lev. xvii. 11, is radically much the same with that formerly propounded in this country by Sykes and Taylor, and frequently advocated by Unitarian writers since, but in none of these with so much depth of thought, and apparent conformity to the fundamental truths of Scripture, as have been brought to bear on it in the pages of Baehr. The first great point the learned author endeavours to make good is, that it was simply the blood sprinkled on the altar which formed the central part of the idea of sacrifice—the blood, however, merely as the bearer of the life, irrespective of the death, which (incidentally, indeed, but still only incidentally, not as a proper and essential part of the transaction,) had to be inflicted in the obtaining of the blood. It is not, therefore, he maintains, the execution of a punishment—the punishment of death—with which we have properly to do, but the giving away of a life to God—the giving away of the life or soul of an irrational animal, as symbolical of the offerer's giving away of his soul to God; in other words his returning back again to God by repentance, and faith, and self-dedication, after having been separated from him by sin. There is nothing, consequently, in his view, strictly vicarious or substitutionary in the matter—no infliction of a punishment de-

served by the offerer, and symbolically transferred to the thing offered; and he thence draws the conclusion, that the death of Christ was no satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of men, but a self-dedication or surrender of the life to God, to be ever appropriated and repeated, by his people spiritually, when they renounce sin and turn to God. So that the death of Christ, relatively to the life of his people, is just a great symbol—the symbol of symbols—representing outwardly, and by means of his personal history, how sinful men, dead because of sin, were to re-unite themselves to the life and fellowship of God.

It is justly remarked by Kurtz, at the commencement of his able refutation of this view of Baehr, p. 7, 12, that it proceeds upon a somewhat mistaken view of the passage in Lev. xvii. 11—as if that professedly treated of sacrifice; whereas it directly treats only of the blood, and not properly of the blood as a constituent part of sacrifice, but as matter of food, and of sacrifice only in so far as the blood belonged to the sacrifice. It is, therefore, to exalt that passage, however otherwise important, out of its due place, when it is regarded as alone sufficient to determine the whole nature and constitution of sacrifice. True, "it speaks only of the blood, it makes account of nothing but this, and does not mention death as the means of atonement." But neither should we have expected it to do so, however necessary the death might be for the effecting of the atonement; for the passage does not discourse of sacrifice, as such, or of death as connected with the sacrifice, but simply aims at grounding the prohibition regarding the eating of blood. For this it was enough to state the relation of the blood to the sacrifice.

There are two questions that naturally arise in discussing the subject; the first of which is: What the nephesh or soul (נפש) is in beasts and men? This is answered with substantial correctness by Baehr, though without giving due prominence to the principle of accountability in man. "By the nephesh," he remarks, "in beast, as well as in man, the Hebrews denoted the animal principle of life, without which the body is a mere lump of matter, hence the word commonly signifies *life*. But in man, while the nephesh in one respect corresponds to that in beasts, in another it is of a higher kind; because it stands in closest connexion, as on the one hand with the body, so on the other with the spirit, is indeed the bond between the two. As such a bond, it is the seat and source of all the emotions, both higher and lower—whence the purely animal appetites of hunger and thirst are ascribed to it, and, at the same time, the purely human and higher affections of love and hatred, joy and sorrow."—(Symb. ii. p. 208.) It is not, however, these affections in themselves, which properly constitute the distinctive superiority of the human, but rather their connexion with conscience and free-will, bringing them within the province of the moral and accountable. This especially is what raises man above the brute creation.

But in the second question—In what relation do the two nephesh, in man and beast, stand to each other in sacrifice? bears much more closely upon our author's peculiar views, and it is here especially that his erroneous sentiments discover themselves. "It is not to be denied, (he says) that in one respect the nephesh of the sacrificial blood is placed on a par with that of the sacrificer, but that in another the sacrificial blood serves also as the means of atonement and salvation for the sacrificer, therefore is an antidote for his sinful nature, and so far stands in a counter-position to his nephesh. The sacrifice itself is thereby constituted into a symbolical-sacramental act; the equalizing or putting on a par of the two nephesh, giving to it a symbolical, and their counter-position a sacramental cha-

racter." This statement is already defective; for, in the words of Kurtz, "the equalizing of the two nephesh, and consequently the symbolical character of the sacrifice, rests upon this, that both have a common basis, as being the seat and source of life; the antithetical, and consequently the sacramental character, rests (since every thing in sacrifice has to do with sin and atonement) upon this, that the one nephesh is free from sin and guilt, while the other is laden with both. The guilt of the one requires an antidote, the guiltlessness of the other fits it for being such. This explanation, however, would certainly square ill with the theory of our learned opponent. But let us hear him farther: 'The symbolical character of the sacrifice stands in this, that the presentation and bringing nigh of the nephesh in the sacrificial blood upon the altar, is the symbol of the presentation and bringing nigh of the offerer to Jehovah. As the presentation of the beast-blood is a giving up and away of the beast-life in death, so must also the natural (seelische,) that is, selfish life of the offerer, acting in contrariety to God, be given up and away, that is, die; but since this is a giving away to Jehovah, it is no mere ceasing to be, but a dying which, *eo ipso*, goes into life. . . . The natural dying is the condition of the true life. Accordingly, the meaning of a sacrifice is in short this, that the natural, sinful being (life,) is given up to God in death, in order to obtain the true being (sanctification,) through fellowship with God.'

"This whole representation (Kurtz continues,) which leads us into the centre of the sacrificial system, and should give us the kernel of it, presents not a few weak points. It seeks to unfold the symbolical aspect of the idea of a sacrifice. This rests, as already indicated, upon the resemblance of the two nephesh, on account of which the nephesh of the beast is made to stand as the image and representative of man's. Now, were this resemblance really the foundation of the view exhibited above, we could have nothing to reply to it. But we find precisely the reverse to be the case. It is not that, in which both are alike to each other, viz., that both are the seat and source of life, feeling, desire and aversion, which is made the foundation of the symbol, but the very thing which renders them unlike to each other. It is not the giving up simply of the life, which it regards as symbolized in the sacrifice, but the giving up of 'the natural, selfish life, acting in contrariety to God;' and this is precisely what renders the soul of a beast dissimilar to that of a man.

"But this is by no means the only contradiction into which Baehr has fallen with his theory; we detect three others. (1.) The import of a sacrifice, he says, is this, that the selfish, natural, sinful being, or life, is given up to death. Through this, therefore, is the atonement made, which effects the covering and extirpation of sin. Here, then, sin and death come so near to each other, that one is involuntarily reminded of the words: Death is the wages of sin; or, Sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death; or, in the concrete declaration of the Old Testament, In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die. And is there not to be found an idea there, that namely of punishment, from the application of which to sacrifice, Baehr shrinks on every hand with the strongest aversion, but which forms the necessary, unavoidable link of connexion between sin and death? We present to our opponent the following progression of ideas: blood, nephesh, lust, sin, punishment, death, atonement. Can he fail to recognise it as his own? We could substantiate it word for word by citations. Undoubtedly, the single word 'punishment' is nowhere to be discovered. But it is merely omitted, and naturally suggests itself. So that the definition given by our opponent has after all opened the door to the idea to which it is so fundamentally opposed. He appears to have been

somewhat conscious of this himself, and endeavours to meet it in a two-fold way. First, by determining the giving up of the sinful nephesh to death more closely, as a giving up in death to Jehovah, which is a dying that, *eo ipso*, goes into life. But the *sinful*, *selfish*, nephesh was not to be given up to Jehovah, but, on the contrary, covered through the sacrificial atonement; that is, had to be put away out of Jehovah's presence, that he might not see it. The giving up of sin, that is, of death in death, is certainly the negation of sin and death, therefore the true life; but then this is no giving up to Jehovah, but giving away from Jehovah, for Jehovah's sake.—The second shift looks more fortunate: the dangerous relation between sin and death is disposed of, as soon as for "the giving up of the selfish, sinful, ungodly nephesh in death to Jehovah," there is substituted, "the giving up of the whole being to God, or the giving up of that which is most peculiarly one's own, the principle of personality or of the individual life." This giving up of the whole life to Jehovah is certainly a receiving, a putting into exercise of life, but it is no giving up in death. But without contending about this substitution, nothing after all is gained by it. For the idea of sin, as the starting-point of sacrifice, cannot possibly be overlooked, and how important and closely related to the idea is death in the sacrifice, is clear even from Baehr's interchange of terms in p. 210. One of two alternatives alone remains: Either to subtract the idea of sin and death, which would certainly make the symbol but ill accord with the idea; or it continues to possess both of those ideas, or one of them—then, in the first case, the giving up of the *sinful* nephesh in death is nothing but the symbolizing of the idea of punishment; but in the second, the giving up of the *sinful* being to Jehovah would be in contrariety to the idea of atonement, (the covering;) and in the third the giving up to Jehovah in death of the nephesh simply, as that "which is most peculiarly one's own, the principle of personality, or of the individual life," would suit well enough indeed to a mystical-pantheistic nature-religion, but extremely ill to the plain, theistical religion of Moses.

"(2.) Baehr repeatedly (for ex. B. ii. p. 278, 343,) throws it out as a reproach against the juridical view, which he so strenuously opposes, that it makes the sacrifice culminate in the death. This, he contends, shows at once how entirely erroneous it is; for nothing can be more unquestionable, than that the blood, and not the death is the very essence and core of the sacrifice.—But now let any one just read Baehr's own development of the idea of sacrifice, and mark how often death and its synonyms occur there; since the subject continually pressed is of a giving away, or a giving up of life in death, of a dying, a ceasing to live, an αποθανειν, as the most essential and innermost idea of sacrifice. When he says, for example: As that presentation of the victim's blood was a giving up and away of 'the life in death, so must also the selfish, natural life be given away, that is, die'—is not this in the strongest manner to identify blood and death? This may well satisfy us, that to make the sacrifice culminate in death, and identify death and blood, cannot be so very senseless and wrong a thing as he would have us to suppose.

"(3.) Sacrifice must symbolize the idea of a giving up and away of the life in death to Jehovah. But this is no common dying, not a mere ceasing to be, not a sort of negative thing only, but a dying that, *eo ipso*, goes into life, is indeed the true life, the life of active and holy energy. The dying thus modified comes out, then, as the chief and most prominent thing. The symbol, however, still remains but a symbol, and as such must correspond to the idea, at least in its most essential part, resemble and image it. But on our author's supposition that essential part would be the

very thing of which no trace were to be found in the symbol. The dying of the beast is really an absolute ceasing, a simple negative: the beast is and remains dead, and nothing whatever takes place to represent the idea of a resumption of life, brought into being through death. Let it not be said that this could not be expected, as such a symbolizing would lie beyond the range of possibility; for we can point to Baehr himself, B. ii. 516, 617, where he shows in the transaction with the two birds at the cleansing of the leper, and with the two goats on the day of atonement, that such a thing was quite possible."

So far, the exposure of what is fallacious and unsatisfactory in Baehr's views, has respect only to the first, the symbolical aspect of sacrifice; the other, or sacramental aspect still remains, and there the heterodox character of his views comes still more prominently out. We give first his representation of this bearing of the rite of sacrifice: "The means of atonement and sanctification must be something apart from the person to be atoned, another thing than himself, and indeed something chosen and appointed by God; for man has not in himself the principle of sanctification; it can proceed only from God, he alone, therefore, can ordain the means of sanctification. But, on the other hand, it must be nothing absolutely different, foreign, or contrary; for it must, at the same time, be the means of salvation (covering,) and must, therefore, enter into an exchange of relationship with the person to be sanctified. This, however, was only possible, if it was somehow related to him, if it was analogous in nature, homogeneous. That other thing, through which the nephesh of the offerer was atoned, or covered, was itself again a nephesh."—II. 212, 213.

Kurtz justly objects to this representation, that it does not properly and fairly touch the important question, how the blood in sacrifice should have come to possess the sacramental character of a means by which the sin or soul was covered, and the offerer was again re-united with Jehovah, and sanctified? Baehr himself seems to be conscious of its defective and unsatisfactory nature; and calls to his aid "the peculiar nature of the Old Testament economy, as in itself external, corporeal, and imperfect, but as such carrying in its bosom the kernel of the perfect, the higher and spiritual. The blood of beasts, which itself was only external, effected also a merely external sanctification and purity. The true and perfect means of salvation and atonement is the blood of Christ, the shedding of which was, *eo ipso*, the giving up of his soul, (Matth. xx. 28,) with which the eternal Spirit was united," (Heb. ix. 12, 14.)

This line of argument is the more extraordinary, Kurtz remarks, "as the author throughout his whole work manifestly avoids bringing typical references within the circle of his investigations. Such a flying for refuge to an element quite foreign to the whole tendency of his work, therefore, appears as a mere expedient, and betrays the strait in which the author found himself. Still we would not particularly quarrel with him for making our Lord and his atoning death a sort of cat's-paw for his literal necessities, if indeed it had been the aim of Christ's incarnation and death to be a cat's-paw for necessities of another kind. This, therefore, might not prevent us from heartily rejoicing at the open door and decided recognition here given of the typical bearing of the most important part of the ritual worship. But we are again checked in this joy, since it is not enough to have robbed the Old Testament sacrifice of its true import to us; the same must also be done in regard to the far more important sacrifice of Christ. The mediation of Christ is therefore only a—though indeed the perfectest—'symbolical substitution, not a real one, no exchange of places; so that also this sacrificial act, if what it represents is not done

over again on the part of man, becomes worthless and vain.' Yet the proper character of Christ's death is somewhat away from the point. The question here simply is, whether what is obscure and unsatisfactory in the representation given of the sacramental character of the Old Testament sacrifice, is thereby removed. We think not,—for a transference of the (improved) Old Testament idea to that of the New Testament for the purpose of proving that from this, is only moving in a circle.

"We place in opposition to Baehr the following train of thought upon the important passage in Leviticus: The soul of the flesh is in the blood. The soul is the seat of feeling, and therefore of lust. But lust gives birth to sin. That properly which sins in man is, therefore, the soul; and as this is associated with the blood, the blood also stands in a casual connexion with sin. Now, it is an eternal law, per quod quis peccat per hoc punitur et idem, (to make the punishment alight on that which has been used as the organ of sin.) The soul, the blood, was the moving force, the starting-point of sin; and now in turn against the soul and the blood comes the punishment, the counter-impression on the part of moral government in the world paralyzing the impression of sin. The sin was the offspring of lust; now the punishment recoils upon the lust, and so becomes a reversal of lust, aversion (unlust.) The soul, in so far as it is life, has sinned; it is also punished, in so far as it is life, therefore, with death: death is the wages of sin. The sinner has involved his blood, his soul, in guilt; if the claims of justice are satisfied, he must be visited with death—temporal, which by being allowed to continue becomes eternal. God, however, does not wish the death of the sinner; he has promised redemption, and already begun to carry it into effect. A manifestation of this tender grace on the part of God is the institution of sacrifice. I have given you, he says, the blood (of the slain victim) upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls. Therefore, blood for blood, soul for soul; that the sinner may escape death, death must alight on the sacrifice; the guiltless blood is shed, in order to cover, to atone for the guilty. Death is the wages of sin; the sacrificed animal suffers death, not in payment of its own sin, for it is without sin, guiltless, but as payment of another's sin; it therefore suffers death as a substitution for the offerer, and Jehovah, who *gave* the blood as the means of atonement, recognises this substitution. The blood shed, and flowing out in death, is then the atonement of the sinner, while the sin has been imputed to the victim, the satisfaction that has been made through death, is imputed to the sinner."

The learned author proceeds to state at some length, in opposition to certain objections of Baehr, that the Old Testament sacrifices of irrational victims could not possibly possess the virtue of making a proper satisfaction for the sins; that in the language of New Testament scripture, "the blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin; and that, consequently, their expiatory worth was all derived from the blood of the great sacrifice, afterwards to be offered in Christ, to which they pointed the faith of the worshippers. The Old Testament sacrifice was, therefore, only an image of the New, a kind of substitute and compensation for it till the fulness of times." We subjoin the substance of the replies which Kurtz has given to the several objections brought by Baehr against what he calls the juridical view of the ancient sacrifices, or their vicarious character.

(1.) It is objected, that as the punishment, death, is made prominent in this view, if it were sound, the punishment should have been inflicted by the priest, God's representative; whereas it was the offerer himself who killed the victim.—But the relation, says Kurtz, p. 75, "of punishment to sin, is a necessary one; the punishment is the continuation (no longer

depending on the sinner's choice) of the sin, its filling up or complement. Sin is a violation of the righteous government of the world, an impression, striking the sinner and paralyzing his sin. But all punishment runs out into death, which is the wages of sin. 'Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.' Sin, therefore, is a half, incomplete thing, calling for its proper completion in death, which again is not something foreign and arbitrary, but essentially belonging to sin; so that the sinner himself may justly be regarded as self-punished. No doubt, the execution of the punishment might also be properly ascribed to God as the righteous governor of the world; but there is a special propriety in allowing the sinner himself, in the institution of sacrifice, to perform the symbolical act of punishment. For there God appears as the merciful Being, who wills not the death of the sinner, but his atonement, his deliverance and salvation—of course in the way of righteousness—the sinner, again, as one who has drawn upon himself through his sin condemnation and death, and conscious of this being the case. Here, then, especially, was it peculiarly proper and significant, that he should accuse himself, that he should pronounce his own judgment, should bring it down symbolically upon himself. Whoever can explain how the criminal, that has deserved death, should even desire this, and so put himself out of the reach of the grace of his monarch, can find no difficulty in explaining how the symbolical act of punishment in sacrifice should have been left to the execution of the sinner himself."

(2.) The juridical view, it is again objected, makes the death, not the blood, the means of atonement, contrary to Lev. xvii. 11. To this Kurtz replies, that the objection does not apply to his view, as he does not by any means make the death, but the blood—the blood, however, as shed, as carrying death along with it—the means of atonement. And as the passage referred to treats, not directly of sacrifice, but only of the prohibition against eating blood, it simply indicates that this was done, because in the blood, the life-blood poured out in death, was to be found by divine ordination the means of atoning for the sins of men, or, in other words, saving them from death.

(3.) According to this view the wrath of God is appeased through the infliction of death on the victim, and hence not man, but God is atoned. God, however, cannot be and never is the object of the atoning (covering, כפר)—"The atoning is the design of the sacrifice; God is never the object of this, but only man; for in God there is nothing to be covered, while in man there is his sin, his desert of condemnation, requiring to be covered. No change passes upon God by the atonement, but only on man. It is the same God, who in just displeasure at the sinner is ready to destroy him; and who, himself unchanged, meets in love and fellowship the justified, whose sin has been atoned. It is the same sun that ministered to the growth and prosperity of the tree, while its roots were implanted in its native soil, and causes it, after having been torn up, to wither and decay. So God remains unchangeably one and the same, whether the saint becomes a sinner, or the sinner a saint, although his agency toward him will display itself in a quite different, and indeed opposite manner."

(4.) If the death of the victim were a punishment, then every sin, for which a sacrifice was brought, must appear deserving of death. But sin-offerings were commanded to be offered for unconscious, and not properly moral, but only theocratical offences. Could God be justly represented as inflicting the punishment of death for such? "The objection (replies Kurtz) proceeds upon a misapprehension of the nature of sin and death. It applies a subjective measure to sin, and overlooks its objective aspect. Every sin is a transgression of the divine will; this is the common basis

of the smallest, as well as of the greatest sin. In this point of view every sin is alike deserving of the curse; death is the wages of the least, as well as the greatest. The death of the victim stands parallel to the death of the offerer, who has deserved death by his sin. The latter is certainly not mere corporeal death, but death in general, in the entire compass which the usage of Scripture gives to the word death. That the death of the sacrificed beast was not equivalent to this death, is obvious; as it is also obvious, that the nephesh of the victim, which was given in death, was in no respect equivalent to the nephesh of the sinner; but in this precisely stood the imperfection of the ancient sacrificial system, which implied and predicted a better one." The learned author might here also have pressed the objection as equally valid against Baehr's own view, as the juridical view he opposes. For if such sins, as those referred to, could not justly expose the individual to the punishment of death, how could they any more, according to the theory of Baehr, produce separation from God, moral death, and require a sacrifice to bring him near again? If they should not have entailed the one consequence, we cannot understand how they should have entailed the other.

(5.) The juridical view, it is once more alleged, exchanges the symbolical substitution for the real, the religious for the righteous; the sacrifice loses all its (symbolical) religious character, and is turned into a purely external mechanical act.—To this Kurtz briefly replies, that it is an entire misrepresentation of the vicarious character of the Old Testament sacrifices, as commonly entertained. So far from being an act of a merely outward and mechanical nature, it was expressive of the deepest and most solemn feelings of which the human heart is capable. And the same may be said in a still higher sense of the vicarious death of Christ, which not only the writings of the New Testament, but the experiences also of the most devout in every age, prove to be capable of stirring the utmost depths of the soul, and drawing around it the loftiest thoughts and aspirations.

It is deeply to be regretted that a work distinguished by such learning, and replete with such depth and freshness of thought, as Baehr's, should carry in its bosom so radical a defect as the false and most unscriptural view of sacrifice, to which the preceding extracts refer. We trust the sounder theology and solid refutation of Kurtz will go far to neutralize the evil in Germany; and tend to re-establish on a firmer basis than ever the view, which Baehr admits (ii. p. 277) to have on its side, not only the most of the rabbinical writers, but also by far the greater number of the most learned and pious of Christian divines. Nor is it to be regarded as any mean confirmation of the truly scriptural character of the view in question, that even such men as Gesenius, De Wette, Winer, and many others of the present day, against strong doctrinal prejudices, have given their assent to it as the doctrine of Scripture. Whatever liberties they have thought themselves warranted to take with the doctrine itself of the vicarious import of ancient sacrifice, they have seen the doctrine too palpably written there, to deny its existence. And we are persuaded that the more thoroughly the subject is examined and considered in all its bearings, the more deeply and broadly will this doctrine be found to have its foundations laid in the pages of revelation, and the clearer also the conviction of its necessary connexion with the peace of the sinner and the interests of righteousness.

CHAPTER V.

THE MOST HOLY PLACE, WITH ITS FURNITURE, AND THE GREAT ANNUAL SERVICE CONNECTED WITH IT ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

THOUGH the tabernacle, as a whole, was God's house or dwelling-place among his people, yet the innermost of its two apartments alone was appropriated for his peculiar place of abode—the seat and throne of his kingdom. It was there in that hallowed recess, where the awful symbol of his presence had its settled abode, and from which, as from his very presence-chamber, the High-priest was to receive the communications of his grace and will, to be through him made known to the people. The things, therefore, which concern it, most immediately and directly respect God; we have here in symbol, the revelation of what God himself is in relation to his people.

I. The apartment itself was a perfect cube of ten cubits, thus bearing on all its dimensions the symbol of completeness—an image of the all-perfect character of the Being who condescended to occupy it as the region of his manifested presence and glory. The ark of the covenant, with the tables of the testimony, and the mercy-seat, with the two cherubim at each end, formed originally and properly its whole furniture. The ark or chest, which was simply made as a depository for holding the two tables of the law, the tables of the covenant, was formed of boards of shittim-wood, overlaid with gold, two and a half cubits long, by one and a half broad, with a crown, or raised and ornamented border of gold around the top. This latter it had in common with the table of show-bread, and the altar of incense; so that it could not have been meant to denote any thing connected with the peculiar design of the ark, and in all cases, indeed, it seems merely to have been added for the purpose of forming a suitable and becoming ornament.

The mercy-seat as it is called in our version, was a piece of solid gold, of precisely the same dimensions in length and breadth as the ark, and ordered to be placed above, on the top of it, probably so as to go within the crown of gold, and fit closely in with it. The Hebrew name is *caporeth*, or covering; but not exactly in the sense of being a mere lid or covering for the ark of the covenant. This might rather be said to suggest, than to express the real meaning of the term as used in the present connexion. For the caporeth is never mentioned as precisely the lid of the ark, or as simply designed to cover and conceal what lay within. It rather appears as occupying a place of its own; though connected with and attached to the ark, yet by no means a mere appendage to it; and hence, both in the descriptions and the enumerations given of the holy things in the tabernacle, it is mentioned separately, (Ex. xxv. 17, xxvi. 34, xxxv. 12, xxxvii. 35, xl. 20.) It sometimes even appears to stand more prominently out than the ark itself, and to

have been peculiarly that for which the Most Holy Place was set apart—as in Lev. xvi. 2, where this Place is described by its being "within the vail before the mercy-seat," and in 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, where it is simply designated "the house of the caporeth," or mercy-seat.

What then was the precise object and design of this portion of the sacred furniture? It was for a covering, indeed, but for that only in the sense of atonement. The word is never used for a covering in the ordinary sense; wherever it occurs, it is always as the name of this one article—a name which it derived from being peculiarly and pre-eminently the place where covering or atonement was made for the sins of the people. There was here, therefore, in the very name, an indication of the real meaning, of the symbol, as the kind of covering expressed by it is covering only in the spiritual sense—atonement. Hence the rendering of the LXX. was made with the evident design of bringing out this: ἱλαστηριον επιθεμα (a propitiatory covering.) Yet, while the name properly conveys this meaning, it was not given without some respect also to the external position of the article in question, which was immediately above and upon, not the ark merely, but the tables of the testimony within: "And thou shalt put the mercy-seat upon the ark of the testimony," (Ex. xxvi. 34;) "the mercy-seat that is over the testimony," (xxx. 6;) "that the cloud of incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony," (Lev. xvi. 13.) The tables of the covenant, as formerly explained (p. 85,) contained God's testimony, not simply for holiness in general, but for that in connexion with his people's transgressions—his testimony against them on account of sin; and as they could not stand before it when thundered with terrific majesty in their ears from Mount Sinai, neither could they spiritually stand before the accusations it was constantly raising against them in the presence of God, in his Holy Place. A covering was therefore needed for them between it, on the one hand, and God on the other—but an atonement-covering. A mere external covering would not do; for the searching, all-seeing eye of Jehovah was there, from which nothing outward can conceal, and the law itself also, from which the covering was needed, is spiritual, reaching to the inmost thoughts of the heart, as well as to every action of the life. That the mercy-seat stood over the testimony, and shut it out from the bodily eye, was a kind of shadow of the provision required; but still even under that dispensation, no more than the shadow, and fitted, not properly to be, but only to suggest what was really required—viz. a covering in the sense of an atonement. The covering required must be a propitiatory, a place on which the holy eye of God may ever see the blood of reconciliation; and the Most Holy Place, as designated from it, and deriving thence its most essential characteristic, might fitly be called "the house of the propitiatory," or "the atonement house," (1 Chron. xxviii. 11.*)

* See Baehr, i. p. 381. Hengs. Authen., ii. p. 209, 641.

At the two ends of this mercy-seat, and rising, as it were, out of it—a part of the same piece, and constantly adhering to it—there were two cherubim, made of beaten gold, with outstretched wings over-arching the mercy-seat, and looking inwards towards each other, and towards the mercy-seat with an appearance of holy wonder and veneration. The symbolical import of these ideal figures has already been fully investigated,* and nothing more is necessary here than a brief indication of their design as connected with the mercy-seat. Placed as they were with their outstretched wings rising aloft and overshadowing the mercy-seat, they gave to this the appearance of a glorious seat or throne, suited for the occupation or residence of God in the symbolic cloud as the King of Israel. That forms of created beings were made to surround this throne of Deity, and impart to it an appearance of becoming grandeur and majesty, this was simply an outward embodiment of the fact, that God ever makes himself known as the God of the living, of whom, not only have countless myriads been formed by his hand, but attendant hosts also continually minister around him and celebrate his glory. And that the particular forms here used were compound figures, representations of ideal beings, and beings whose component parts consisted of the highest kinds of life on earth in its different spheres—man first and chiefly, and with him the ox, the lion, and the eagle—this, again, denoted that the forms and manifestations of creature-life, among whom and for whom God there revealed himself, were not of heaven, but of earth—chiefly indeed, and pre-eminently man, who, when the work of redemption is complete, and he is fitted to dwell in the most excellent glory of the divine presence, shall be invested with the properties of what is still to him but an ideal perfection, and be made possessor of a yet higher nature, and stand in yet nearer fellowship with God, than he did in the paradise that was lost. But these new hopes of fallen humanity all centre in the work of reconciliation and love, shadowed forth upon the mercy-seat; thither, therefore, must the faces of these ideal heirs of salvation ever look, and with outstretched wing hang around the glorious scene, as in wondering expectation of the things now proceeding in connexion with it, and hereafter to be revealed. So that God sitting between the cherubim, is God revealing himself as on a throne of grace, in mingled majesty and love, for the recovery of his fallen family on earth, and their final elevation to the highest region of life, and blessedness, and glory.—This explanation applies substantially to the curtains, which formed the whole interior of the tabernacle, and which were throughout inwrought with figures of cherubim. Not the throne merely, but the entire dwelling of God, was in the midst of these representatives (as we conceive them) of redeemed and glorified humanity.

The articles now described formed properly the whole furniture of the Most Holy Place, being all that was required to give a

* Typology of Scripture, former volume, p. 187, ss.

suitable representation of the character and purposes of God in relation to his people. But three other things were afterwards added, and placed, as it is said, before the Lord, or before the testimony—the pot of manna, the rod of Aaron, and the entire book of the law. These were all lodged there in the immediate presence of God, as in a safe and appropriate depository—lodged partly as memorials of the past, and partly as signs and witnesses for the future. The manna testified of God's power and willingness to give food for the life of his people even in the most destitute circumstances—to sustain life in parched lands—and was ready to witness against them in all time coming, if they should distrust his goodness or repair to other sources for life and blessing. The rod of Aaron, which in itself was as dry and lifeless as the rods of the other tribes, but which "brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds," through the quickening and sovereign agency of God, testified of the appointment of Aaron to the priestly office —of him alone, not, however, as some wickedly affirmed, to the damage and death of the congregation, but rather for their life and fruitfulness in all that is pure and good. It was, therefore, well fitted to serve as a witness in every age against those, who might turn aside from God's appointed channel of grace, and choose to themselves other modes of access to him, than such as he had himself chosen and ordained. Finally, the book of the law, which contained all the statutes and ordinances, the precepts and judgments, the threatenings and promises, delivered by the hand of Moses, and which it was the part of the priests and Levites to teach continually, and on the seventh or sabbatical year to read throughout in the audience of the people, this being put beside, or in the ark of the covenant, testified God's care to provide his people with a full revelation of his will, and stood there as a perpetual witness before God against his ministering servants, in case they should prove unfaithful to their charge (Deut. xxxi. 26.)—But these things were rather accessories to the furniture of the Most Holy Place, than essential parts of it. The ark of the covenant, with the tables of testimony within, and the mercy-seat with the cherubim of glory above, upon the testimony, these alone were the sacred things, for the reception of which that interior sanctuary was properly reserved and set apart. With these only, then, we have here to do.

II. Now, considered in themselves, and without respect to any service connected with them, what a clear and striking representation did they present to the Israelite of the spiritual and holy nature of God! How much was here to be learned of his perfections and character! It is true, as certain writers have been at pains to tell us, there was nothing absolutely original in the plan of a sacred building or structure, having an inner sanctuary, with a chest or shrine of the Deity deposited there, in whose honour the house was erected. But what then? Does this general similarity account for what we have here, or place the one upon a level with the other? Far from it. For what do we perceive, when we look into those shrines that stood in the innermost recesses, in

particular of Egyptian temples? Some paltry or hideous idol, formed after the similitude of a beast, sacredly preserved and worshipped as a representative of the Deity, and this only as a substitute for the living creatures themselves, which appear to have been kept in the larger temples. "Living animals (says Jablonsky, Pan. Proll. p. 86,) such as were worshipped for images or statues, and treated with all divine honours, were to be found only in temples solemnly consecrated to the gods, and indeed only in certain of these. But effigies of these animals were to be seen in many other temples through the whole of Egypt, and are still discovered among their ruins." And another says: "Some of the sacred boats or arks contained the emblems of life and stability, which, when the veil was drawn aside, were partially seen; and others presented the sacred beetle of the sun, overshadowed by the wings of two figures of the goddess Thmei or Truth."* But what, on the other hand, do we perceive, when we turn from these instruments of a debasing and abominable superstition, to look into the innermost sanctuary of the tabernacle? No outward similitude of any kind, that might be taken for an emblem or an image of God; nor any representation of him, but what was to be found in that revelation of law, which unfolds what he is in himself, by disclosing what he requires of moral and religious duty from his people—a law which the more reason is enlightened, the more does it consent to as "holy, just, and good," and which, therefore, reveals a God infinitely worthy of the adoration and love of his creatures. We here discern an immeasurable gulf between the religion of Moses and that of the nations of heathen antiquity; and also see, how the Israelites were taught, in the most central arrangements of their worship, the necessity of serving God in spirit, and of rendering all their worship subservient to the cultivation of the great principles of holiness and truth.

But considered farther, with reference to the professed object and design of the whole, what correct and elevated views were here presented of the fellowship between God and men? Had God only appeared as represented by the law of perfect holiness, who then could stand before him? Or if without law, as a God of mercy and compassion, stooping to hold converse with sinful men, and receiving them back to his favour, what security should have been taken for guarding the rectitude of his government? But here, with the ark and the mercy-seat together, we behold him in perfect adaptation to the circumstances of men, appearing at once as the just God and the Saviour—keeping in his innermost sanctuary, nay, placing underneath his throne, as the very foundation on which

* Wilkinson, v. p. 265, last ed. We should doubt if in any case emblems of life and stability formed the only, or even the chief figures, since beast-worship was the leading characteristic of Egyptian idolatry. But even in external form, none of the arks referred to present any proper resemblance of that of God. They always possess the ship or boat form, with something like an altar in the midst: they have nothing corresponding to the mercy-seat; and the chief purpose for which they appear to have been used, was to preserve an image of the creature that was worshipped as emblematical of the god.

it rested, the revelation of his pure and holy law, and, at the same time, providing for the transgressions of his people a covering of mercy, that they might still draw near to him and live. It is already in principle the mystery of redemption—the manifestation of a God himself just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly—of a God, whose throne is alike the dwelling-place of righteousness and mercy—righteousness upholding the claims of law, mercy stretching out the sceptre of grace to the penitent: Both, even then, continually exercised, but rising at length to unspeakably their grandest display on the cross of Calvary, where justice is seen pouring out on the Lamb of God the wrath to the uttermost against sin, and mercy providing at an infinite cost a way for sinners into the Holiest of all.

Since the ark of the covenant and the mercy-seat contained such a complete revelation of what God was in himself and toward his people, we can easily understand why the symbol of his presence, the overshadowing cloud of glory, should have specially connected itself with that, and why the life and soul of the whole Jewish theocracy should have been regarded as concentrated there. *There* peculiarly was "the place of the Lord's throne, and the place of the soles of his feet, where he had his dwelling among the children of Israel," (Ex. xliii. 7.) Hence, it was called emphatically, "the glory of the Lord," and on their possession or loss of this sacred treasure, the people of God felt that all, which properly constituted their glory, depended—(Ps. lxxviii. 61; 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22.) It was before this, as containing the symbol of a present God, that they came to worship (Josh. vii. 6; 2 Chron. v. 6;) and from a passage in the life of David (2 Sam. xv. 32,) where it is said according to the proper rendering: "And it came to pass that when David was come to the top (of the Mount of Olives, where the last look could be obtained of the sacred abode,) where it is wont to do homage to God,"—it would appear, that as soon as they came in sight of the place of the ark, or obtained their last view of it, they were in the habit of prostrating themselves in adoration. Happy, if they had but sufficiently remembered that Jehovah, being in himself, and even there representing himself, as a spiritual and holy God, while he condescended to make the ark his resting-place, and to connect with it the symbol of his glory (Lev. xvi. 2; "for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat,") yet could not so indissolubly bind his presence and his glory to it, as if the one might not be separated from the other! By terrible things in righteousness the Israelites were once and again made to learn this salutary lesson, when rather than appear their patron and guardian in sin. the Lord showed that he would, in a manner, leave his throne empty, and give up his glory into the enemy's hands. The cloud of glory was still but a symbol, which must disappear when the glorious Being who resided in it could no longer righteously manifest his goodness; and the ark itself, and the tabernacle that contained it, became but a common thing. Nor is it otherwise now, when men hold the truth of God's salvation in unrighteousness;

the extent to which they exercise belief in the truth utterly fails to secure for them any real tokens of his regard; even while they handle the symbols of his presence, he is to them an absent God; and when the hour of trial comes, they find themselves forsaken and desolate.*

III. But it is only when viewed in connexion with the service of the day of atonement—the one day on which the Most Holy Place was entered by the high-priest, that we can fully perceive either the symbolical import or the typical bearing of its sacred furniture. That not only no Israelite, but that no consecrated priest, that not the high-priest himself, was permitted at all times to enter within the veil, that even he was limited in the exercise of this high privilege to one day in the year, "lest he should die;" this most impressively bespoke the difficulties which stood in the way of a sinner's approach to the righteous God, and how imperfectly these could be removed by the ministrations of the earthly tabernacle, and the blood of slain beasts. It indicated, that the holiness which reigned in the presence of God required on the part of men a work of righteousness to lay open the way of access, such as could not then be brought in, and that while the church should gladly avail itself of the temporary and imperfect means of reconciliation then placed within her reach, she should be ever looking forward to a brighter period, when every obstruction being removed, her members would be able to go with freedom into the presence of God, and with open face behold the manifestations of his glory.

1. In considering more closely the service in question, we have first to notice the leading character of the day's solemnities. The day was to be "a Sabbath of rest," (Lev. xvi. 31,) yet, not like other Sabbaths, a day of repose and satisfaction, but a day on which they "should afflict their souls." This striking peculiarity in the mode of its observance arose from the nature of the service peculiar to it; it was the day of atonement, or literally, of atonements, (Lev. xxiii. 26,) not a day so much for one act of atonement, as for atonement in general, for the whole work of propitiation. The main part of the Mosaic worship consisted in the presentation of sacrifice, as the guilt of sin was perpetually calling for new acts of purification; but on this one day the idea of atonement by sacrifice gathered itself up, and became concentrated in one grand comprehensive expression; and in suitable correspondence to this design, the sense of sin was in like manner to be deepened to its utmost intensity upon the national mind, and brought out into becoming forms of penitential grief. It was a day of humiliation and godly

* The tendency above referred to, of regarding God's presence and glory as inseparably and necessarily, instead of only symbolically and morally, connected with the ark and mercy-seat, was a fruit of the carnality of the people, and gave different indications of itself according to the circumstances and delusions of particular times. It was partly to show them the folly of such a mode of thinking, to show them that there was nothing peculiar to the ark but what might be found any where, that the prophet Jeremiah, ch. iii. 16, made promise of a time, when it should no longer be said, "The ark of the covenant of the Lord, neither would it be remembered, &c. for Jerusalem would be the throne of the Lord;" *i. e.* all Jerusalem, the whole city of God, would be as sacred and holy as the ark once was.—Compare Zech. xiv. 20, 21.

sorrow working unto repentance. But why all this, peculiarly on the day of entrance into the Most Holy Place? Was it not a good and joyful occasion for men personally, or through their representative, to be admitted into such near fellowship with God? Doubtless it was; but that dwelling-place of God is a region of absolute holiness; the fiery law is there, which reveals the purity of Heaven, and is ready to flame forth in indignation and wrath against all unrighteousness of men. And so the day of nearest approach to God, as it is on his part the day of atonement, must be on the part of his people a day for the remembrance of sin, and for the exercise of suitable feelings of sorrow and abasement concerning it. For to the penitent alone is there forgiveness; not simply to men as sinners, but to men convinced of sin, and humbled on account of it; viewing sin, in short, as God views it, and glorifying his justice in its deserved condemnation and doom. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive them;" but without confession there can be no forgiveness, no atonement, as we have not yet entered into God's mind and judgment respecting sin.*

2. But if the remembrance of iniquity which was made on this day, gave to it a character of depression and gloom, the purpose and design of its services could not fail to render it in the result, at least, a season of blessed rest and consolation. For atonement was then made for all sin and transgression. It was virtually implied, that the acts of expiation, which were ever taking place throughout the year, but imperfectly satisfied for the iniquities of the people, inasmuch as they were still kept outwardly at some distance from the immediate dwelling-place of God, and could not even by their consecrated head be allowed to go within the vail. So that when a service was instituted with the view of giving a representation of complete admission to God's presence and fellowship, the mass of sin must again be brought into consideration, that it might be blotted out by a more perfect atonement. And not only so, but as God's dwelling and the instruments of his worship were ever contracting defilement, from "remaining among men in the midst of their uncleanness," so these also required to be annually purified on this day by the more perfect atonement, which was then made in the presence of God. Not that these things were in themselves capable of contracting guilt, but were so viewed in respect to the sins of the people, which were ever proceeding around them, and which brought a certain degree of defilement even into the holiest services of the holiest persons. And that no remnant of guilt, or of its effects, might appear to be left behind, the atonement was to be made and accepted for sin in all its bearings—for the High-priest and his house, for the tabernacle and its sacred utensils, and for the people in all their families.

* The day itself was the tenth of the seventh month, usually happening toward the middle or end of October, about the close of the busier occupations of the year, and before the commencement of winter. It was not expressly ordered to be kept as a fast (fasting as an ordinance nowhere occurs in the Pentateuch,) but it would naturally be so observed for the most part, and, indeed, latterly, was familiarly named, the fast.—Acts xxvii. 9.

3. In this service, then, which contained the quintessence of all sacrifice, and gave the most exact representation the ancient worship could afford of the all-perfect atonement of Christ, there was every thing in the manner of accomplishing it to mark its singular importance and solemnity. The high-priest alone had here to transact with God; and as the representative of the entire spiritual community, to go with their sins as well as his own, into the immediate presence of God. After the usual morning oblations, at which, if he had personally officiated, he had to strip himself of the rich and beautiful garments with which he was wont to be attired, as unsuitable for the services of a day which so peculiarly stained the glory of all flesh, and after having washed himself, he put on the plain garments, which, from the stuff (linen,) and from the colour (white,) were denominated "garments of holiness," (ver. 4, see also p. 200,) and were peculiarly appropriated for the work of this day. Then, when thus prepared, he had first of all to take a bullock for a sin-offering for himself and his house, that is, the whole sacerdotal family, and go with the blood of this offering within the veil. Yet not with this alone, but also with a censer filled with live coals from the altar of burnt-offering, to which handfuls of incense were applied, that there might arise a cloud of fragrant odours as he entered the Most Holy Place—the emblem of acceptable prayer. The meaning was, that with all the pains he had taken to purify himself, and with the blood, too, of atonement in his hand, he must still go as a suppliant into that region of holiness, as one who had no right to demand admittance, but humbly imploring it from the hand of a gracious God. Having thus entered within, he had to sprinkle with the blood upon the mercy-seat, and again before the mercy-seat seven times—seven times the number of the oath or the covenant—and a double act of atonement, the one apparently having respect to the persons interested, and the other to the apartments and furniture of the sanctuary, as defiled by their defilements.

When this more personal act of expiation was completed, that for the sins of the people commenced. Two goats were presented at the door of the tabernacle, which, though two, are still expressly named one victim (v. 5, "two kids of the goats for a sin-offering,") so that the sacrifice consisted of two merely from the natural impossibility of otherwise giving a full representation of what was to be done; the one being designed more especially to exhibit the means, the other the effect of the atonement. And this circumstance, that the two goats were properly but one sacrifice, and also that they were together presented by the high-priest before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle, (v. 7,) indisputably stamped the sacrifice as the Lord's. Nor was the same obscurely intimated in the action which there took place respecting them, viz., the casting of lots upon them; for this was wont to be done only with what peculiarly belonged to God, and for the purpose of ascertaining what might be his mind in the matter. The point to be determined respecting the two, was not, which God might claim for him-

self, and which might belong to another, but simply to what particular destination he appointed the two parts of a sacrifice, which was wholly and exclusively his own. And, indeed, the destination itself of each as thus determined could not be materially different; it could not have been an entirely diverse or heterogeneous destination, since it appeared in itself an immaterial thing, which should take the one place and which the other, and was only to be determined by the casting of the lot.*

Of these lots, it is said, that the one was to be for the Lord, and the other for the scape-goat, as in our version, but literally for Azazel. The one on which the Lord's lot fell was forthwith to be slain as a sin-offering for the sins and transgressions of the people; and with its blood, as with that of the bullock previously, the high-priest again entered the Most Holy Place, and sprinkled, as before, the mercy-seat first, and then before it seven times; making atonement for the guilt of the congregation, both as regarded their persons and the furniture of the tabernacle. After which, having come out from the Most Holy into the Holy Place, he sprinkled the altar of incense seven times with the blood both of the bullock and of the goat, "to cleanse and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel," (v. 18, comp. with Ex. xxx. 10.)

It was now, after the completion of the atonement by blood, that the high-priest confessed over the live goat still standing at the door of the tabernacle, "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions," and thereafter sent him away, laden with his awful burden, by a fit person into the wilderness, into a land of separation, where no man dwelt. It is expressly said, v. 22, that this was done with the goat that he might bear all their iniquities thither; but these iniquities, as already atoned by the blood of the other goat—the other half, so to speak, of the sacrifice—for as on the one hand without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin by the law of Moses, so on the other hand, where blood *was* duly shed, in the way and manner the law required, remission followed as a matter of course. The action with this second goat, therefore, is by no means to be dissevered from the action with the first; but rather to be regarded as the continuation of the latter, and its proper complement. Hence the second or live goat is represented as standing at the door of the tabernacle, v. 10, while atonement was being made with the blood of the first, as being himself interested in the work that was proceeding, and in a sense the object of it. He was presented there —not to have atonement made with him, as is unhappily expressed in our version—but to be covered upon, atoned for, or absolved. And it is only after this process of atonement and absolution is accomplished that the high-priest returns to him, and lays on him the now atoned for iniquities, that he might carry them away into a desert place. So that the part he has to do in the transaction is simply to bear them off and bury them out of sight, as things con-

* See Baehr, Symbolik, ii. p. 678.

cerning which the justice of God had been satisfied, which were no more to be taken into account, fit tenants of a land of separation and forgetfulness.*

Thus from the circumstances of the transaction, when correctly put together and carefully considered, we can have no difficulty in ascertaining the main object and intent of the action with the live goat—without determining any thing as to the exact import of the term Azazel. We shall give at the end of the chapter a brief summary of the views which have been entertained regarding it, and state the one which we are inclined to adopt. But for the right interpretation of this part of the service, nothing material, we conceive, depends on it. What took place with the live goat was merely intended to unfold, and render palpably evident to the bodily eye, the effect of the great work of atonement. The atonement itself was made in secret, while the high-priest alone was in the sanctuary, and yet, as all in a manner depended on its success, it was of the utmost importance that there should be a visible transaction, like that of the dismissal of the scape-goat, embodying in a sensible form the results of the service. Nor is it of any moment what became of the goat after being conducted into the wilderness. It was enough that he was led into the region of drought and desolation, where, as a matter of course, he should never more be seen or heard of. With such a destination, he was obviously as much a doomed victim as the one whose life-blood had already been shed and brought within the vail; he went where "all death lives and all life dies;" and so exhibited a most striking image of the everlasting oblivion into which the sins of God's people are thrown, when once they are covered with the blood of an acceptable atonement.

The remaining parts of the service were as follows: The high-priest put off the plain linen garments in which, as alone appropriate for such a service, the whole of it had been performed, and laid them up in the sanctuary till the next day of atonement should come round. Then having washed himself with water—which he had to do at the beginning and end of every religious service—and having put on his usual garments, he came forth and offered a burnt-offering for himself, and another for the people—by the blood of which atonement was again made for sin (implying that

* That the sense here given to the expression in v. 10 respecting the live goat, לכפר עליו to cover upon him, or to make atonement for him, is the correct and only well-grounded one, may now be regarded as conclusively established. Bochart, Witsius, and many other eminent divines, did certainly render it as in our version, to make atonement with him. But Cocceius already stated that he could find no case in which the expression was used, "excepting for the persons in whose behalf the expiation was made, or of the sacred utensils," when spoken of as expurgated. Baehr expressly affirms, that the means of atonement is never marked by על, but always by ב, and that the former regularly marks the object of the atonement, (ii. p. 683.) Hengstenberg also concurs in this view, Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 165, who further remarks, that by the live goat being said to be atoned for, "he was thereby identified with the first, and the nature of the dead was transferred to the living; so that the two goats stand here in a relation entirely similar to that of the two birds in the purification of the leper, of which the one let go was first dipped in the blood of the one slain:"—When all this is duly considered, it will at once be seen how futile the objections which many, latterly Baehr, have raised from the case of the live goat against the necessity of death for atonement.

sin mingled itself even in these holiest services,) as by the action with the other parts there was expressed anew the dedication of their persons and services to the Lord. The fat of the sin-offering also—as in cases of sin-offering generally—the high-priest burnt upon the altar; while the bodies of the victims were—as in the case of sin-offerings generally for the congregation, or the high-priest as its head, Lev. iv. 1–21—carried without the camp into a clean place and burned there. This could not be in consequence of any defilement properly inhering in them—for then it should not have been provided that the burning was to be done in a *clean* place, and, besides, after the atonement had been made and accepted with the blood, the blood itself became most holy, and, as a necessary consequence, the flesh also must have been holy. Hence in ordinary cases of sin-offerings it was to be eaten only by holy persons, by the priests; and that the flesh in this case, and others of a like nature, was to be wholly burnt, and not eaten, arose from the priesthood themselves, and as representatives of the congregation, being concerned in the sacrifice; so that it was fit the whole should be consumed by fire. Finally, the person employed in burning them, as also the person who had conducted the scape-goat into the wilderness, were on their return to the congregation to wash themselves—as being relatively impure; not in the strict and proper sense, for if they had really contracted guilt, an atonement would have had to be offered for them; and the relative impurity could only have arisen from their having been engaged in handling what, though in itself not unclean, but rather the reverse, yet in its meaning and design carried a respect to the sins of the people.*

IV. It is the less necessary that we should enlarge on the correspondence between this most important service of the Old Testament dispensation, and the work of Christ under the New, that it is the part of the Mosaic ritual, which of all others has received the most explicit application from the pen of inspiration. It is to this that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews most especially and frequently refers when pointing to Christ for the great realities which were darkly revealed under the ancient shadows. He tells us, that through the flesh of Christ, given unto death for the sins of the world, a new and living way has been provided into the holiest, as through a vail, no longer concealing and excluding from the presence of God, but opening to receive every penitent transgressor—of which, indeed, the literal rending of the vail at Christ's death (Matth. xxvii. 51) was already a matter of fact announcement;—that through the blood of Jesus we can enter not only with safety, but even with boldness into the region of God's manifested presence—that this arises from Christ himself having gone with his own blood into the heavens, that is, present-

* The full explanation and establishment of what is necessarily stated with much brevity here, both regarding the burnt-offerings, and the burning of the sin-offerings, and the washings of men employed, must be reserved till we come to the different kinds of sacrifice.

ing himself there as the Redeemer of his people, who had borne for them the curse of sin, and for ever satisfied the justice of God concerning it;—and that the sacrifice by which all this has been accomplished, being that of One infinitely precious, is attended with none of the imperfections belonging to the Old Testament service, but is adequate to meet the necessities of a guilty conscience, and to present the spirit as well as the flesh of the sinner with acceptance before God (Heb. ix. x.) This is the substance of the information given us respecting the things of Christ's kingdom, in so far as these were foreshadowed by the services of the day of atonement; in which, it will be observed, our attention is chiefly drawn to a correspondence in the two cases of essential relations and ideas. We find no countenance given to the merely outward and superficial resemblances, which have so often been arbitrarily, and sometimes even with palpable incorrectness, drawn by Christian writers; such as that in the high-priest's putting on and again laying aside the white linen garments, was typified Christ's assuming, and then, when his work on earth was finished, renouncing the likeness of *sinful* flesh; in the two goats, his twofold nature; in their being taken from the congregation, his being purchased with the public money; in the slain goat a dying, in the live goat a risen Saviour; or, in the former, Christ, in the latter, Barabbas, or, as the older Cocceians more commonly have it, the Jewish people sent into the desert of the wide world, with God's curse on them. This last notion has been revived by Professor Bush in the Biblical Repository for July, 1842, and in his notes on Leviticus, who gravely states, that the live goat made an atonement simply by being let go into the desert, and that the Jewish people made propitiation for their sins by being judicially subjected to the wrath of Heaven! In which case, of course, the region of the lost should be pre-eminently the place for propitiations; for there certainly in the fullest sense the wrath falls on men to the uttermost!

We inevitably run into such erroneous and puerile conceits, or move at least amid shifting uncertainties, so long as we isolate the different parts of the outward transaction, and seek a distinct and separate meaning in each of them, apart from the grand idea or relation with which they are connected. Let us rise above this defective and arbitrary mode of conception, and fix our view on the real and essential elements in the respective cases, and we shall find all that is required to satisfy the just conditions of type and antitype, as well as much to confirm and establish the hearts of believers in the faith. For what do we not behold? On the one side, the high-priest, the head and representative of a visible community, all stricken with the sense of sin, going under the felt load of innumerable transgressions into the awful presence of Jehovah, as connected with the outward symbols of an earthly sanctuary; permitted to stand there in peace and safety, because entering with the incense of devout supplication and the blood of an acceptable sacrifice; and in token that all sin was forgiven, and

all defilement purged away, sending the mighty mass of atoned guilt into the waste howling wilderness, to remain for ever buried and forgotten. On the other side, corresponding to this, we behold Christ, the head and representative of a spiritual and invisible church, charging himself with all their iniquities, and, having poured out his soul unto death for them, hereafter ascending into the presence of the Father, as with his own life-blood shed in their behalf; so that they now, sprinkled with this blood, or spiritually interested in this work of atonement and intercession, can personally draw near with boldness to the throne of grace, their sins blotted out from the book of God's remembrance, and shall in due time be admitted to dwell amid the bright effulgence of his most excellent glory. Does faith stagger, while it contemplates so free an absolution, so near an approach, so elevating a prospect? Or, having once apprehended, is it apt to lose the clearness of its view and the firmness of its grasp, from having to do with things which lie so within the territory of the unseen and eternal? Let it throw itself back upon the plain and palpable transactions of the type, which on this account also are written for our learning and comfortable assurance. And if truly conscious of the burden of sin, and turning from it with grief and hatred to the Lamb of God, who has been set forth as a propitiation to take away its guilt, then, with what satisfaction Israel of old beheld the high-priest, when the work of reconciliation was accomplished, send their iniquities away into a land of forgetfulness, and with what joy they then rejoiced, let us rest assured that we are now warranted to cherish the same, not doubting that, in the outward literalities of the shadow, the Lord has portrayed distinctly before us the inward and hidden realities of the substance.

The term Azazel, which is four times used in connexion with the ceremony of the day of atonement, and nowhere else, is still a matter of controversy, and its exact and determinate import is not to be pronounced on with certainty. It is not precisely applied to the live-goat as a designation; but this goat is said to be "for Azazel" (לעזאזל.)

1. Yet one of the earliest opinions prevalent upon the subject regards it as the name of the goat himself: Symmachus, τραγος απεξχομενος, Aquila τρ. απολελυμμενος, Vulg. hircus emissarius; so also Theodoret, Cyrill, Luther, Heine, Vater, and the English translators, *scape-goat*. When taken in this sense, it is understood to be compounded of *az* (עז) a goat, and *azal* (אזל) to send away. The chief objections to it are, that *az* never occurs as a name for a buck or he-goat, (in the plural it is used as a general designation for *goats*, but in the singular occurs elsewhere only as the name for a she-goat,) and that in v. 10 and 26, Azazel is expressly distinguished from the goat, the one being said to be *for* the other. For these reasons, this view is now almost entirely abandoned. 2. It is the name of a place, either a precipitous mountain, in the wilderness to which the goat was led, and from which he was thrown headlong, or a lonely region where he was left; so Pseudo Jonathan, Abenezra, Jarchi, Bochart, Deyling, Reland, Carpzov, &c. The chief objection to this view is, that it does not seem to accord with what is said in v. 10: "to let him go for Azazel into the wilderness," which would then mean, for a desert place into a desert place. 3. It is the name of Satan, or an evil spirit: So the LXX. αποπομπαιος (which does not mean "the sent away," the scape-goat, as most of the older interpreters took it, and as we are still rather surprised to see it rendered by Sir J. Brenton in his recent translation of the LXX., but "the turner away," "the averter." See Gesen. Thes., Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 270.) So probably Josephus, Antiq. iii. 10, 3, and

many of the Rabbins. In the strongest and most offensive sense this opinion was espoused by Spencer, Ammon, Rosenmuller, Gesenius, who all concur in holding, that by Azazel is to be understood what was called by the Romans averruncus, a sort of cacodæmon, inhabiting the desert, and to be propitiated by sacrifice, so that the evils he had power to inflict might be averted. The opinion was first modified by Witsius, (who is also substantially followed by Meyer, Turretin, Alting, &c.) to indicate Christ's relation to the devil, to whom he was given up to be tried and vexed, but whom he overcame. And in recent times, it has been still farther modified by Hengstenberg, who says in his Christology on Gen. iii., "The sending forth of the goat was only a symbolical transaction. By this act the kingdom of darkness and its prince were renounced, and the sins to which he had tempted, and through which he had sought to make the people at large or individuals among them his own, were in a manner sent back to him; and the truth was expressed in symbol, that he to whom God grants forgiveness, is freed from the power of evil." The opinion has been still further explained and vindicated by the learned author in his Eg. and Books of Moses, where he supposes the action to carry a reference to the practice so prevalent in Egypt of propitiating, in times especially of famine or trouble, the evil God Typhon, who was regarded as peculiarly delighting in the desert. This reference he holds, however, not in the gross sense of the goat being a sacrifice to the evil spirit; for both goats he considers to have been the Lord's, and this latter only to have been given up by the Lord to the evil spirit, after the forgiven sins were laid on it, as indicating that that spirit had in such a case no power to injure or destroy. Comp. Zech. iii. 1, 5. 4. Many of the greatest scholars on the continent, Tholuck first, then Steudel, Winer, Baehr, take the word as the Pealpal-form of *azal* (עזל,) to remove, with the omission of the last letter, and the putting in its place of an unchangeable vowel; so that the meaning comes to be, for a complete removing or dismissal. Kurtz hesitates between this view and that of Hengstenberg, but in the result rather inclines to the latter. Certainly the contrast presented respecting the destinations of the two goats, is best preserved by Hengstenberg's. But still to bring Satan into such prominence in a religious rite—to place him in a sort of juxtaposition with Jehovah in any form, has an offensive appearance, and derives no countenance from any other part of the Mosaic religion. And however on a thoughtful consideration it might have been found to oppose a tendency to demon-worship, with the less thinking multitude, we suspect, it would be found to operate in a contrary direction. Besides, if it may be objected, as it has been, to Tholuck's view, that it takes a very rare and peculiar way of expressing a quite common idea, so unquestionably to designate, according to the other view, the evil spirit, about whom, if really intended, there should have been no room for mistake by a name never again occurring, appropriated solely for this occasion, is yet more strange and unaccountable.

This very circumstance of a word having been coined for the occasion, and entirely appropriated to it, suggests what seems to me the right view. That appears to have been done on two accounts--partly, that no one might suppose a known and real personage to be meant, and partly, that the idea, which the occasion was intended to render peculiarly prominent, might thus be presented in the most palpable form —might become for the time a sort of personified existence. The idea of utter separation or removal is what Hengstenberg, as well as the other eminent scholars who hold the last opinion specified, regard as the radical meaning of the term; and by its form being properly a substantive, he conceives, that it denotes Satan as the apostate, or separate one. But there is nothing in the whole transaction to lead us to suppose that such an adversary is brought forward; and when the goat is sent away, it is simply said to be "that he might bear the iniquities of Israel into a land of separation"—the conductor of the goat has fulfilled his commission, when he has "let go the goat into the wilderness," v. 22. To have the iniquities conveyed by a symbolical action into that desert and separate region, into a state of oblivion, was manifestly the whole intention and design of the rite. And why might not this condition of utter separateness or oblivion, to render the truth symbolized more distinct and tangible, be represented as a kind of existence, to whom God sent and consigned over the forgiven iniquities of his people? Till these iniquities were atoned for, they were in God's presence, seen and manifested before him; but now he despatches them to the realms of the ideal prince of separation and oblivion, that they may never more appear among the living (Micah vii. 19.) From the great peculiarity of the service, it is impossible to support this view by any thing exactly parallel; but there is certainly something not very unlike, in the personification which so often meets us of Sheol or Hades, as the Great devourer and concealer of men.—Comp. especially Psalm xvi. 10; xlix. 14; Isa. xiv.; xxv. 8, &c.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HOLY PLACE—THE ALTAR OF INCENSE—THE TABLE OF SHOW-BREAD—THE CANDLESTICK.

As the Most Holy Place was peculiarly for God in the Tent of Meeting, so the Holy Place was peculiarly for the people, who occupied it by representation in the priesthood. Into this apartment the priests went every day to accomplish the service of God, having freedom at all times to go in and out. It might, therefore, be justly regarded as their special habitation; and the furniture and services belonging to it would with equal propriety express their relation to God, as those of the Most Holy Place expressed the relation of God to them. We shall find this fully borne out by a consideration of the several particulars. The first of these is—

THE ALTAR OF INCENSE.

Its position appears to have been the nearest to the vail, which formed the entrance into the Most Holy Place, and indeed immediately in front of it. "Thou shalt put it before the vail, that is by the ark of the testimony; before the mercy-seat, that is over the testimony, where I will meet with thee," (Ex. xxx. 6.) The meaning of the direction obviously is, that this altar was to be placed directly before the vail, that is, near to it, and in the middle of the apartment; and this for the reason, that being so placed, it might the more readily be viewed as standing in a kind of juxtaposition to the mercy-seat. Hence also in Lev. xvi. 18, it is called "the altar that is before the Lord," being as near to his throne as the daily service to be performed on it admitted. In regard to its form and structure, it was to be a cubic square, and two cubits in height; made of shittim-wood overlaid with gold, with jutting points or corners called horns, and a crown, or ornamented edge of gold. That it was an altar, determines it to have been for sacrifice of some sort, or offerings to God; but not offerings of blood, which had to do with sin and atonement. The only altar for these was without the tabernacle, where the worshipper must have been reconciled and purified, before he could obtain admission as a guest into the Lord's house. And when admitted there, as his intercourse with God must now be of a closer kind, being the intercourse of one who had already come into a friendly relation to God, so the kind of sacrifice presented on this altar we naturally expect to form a symbolical expression of the innermost desires and feelings of a devout spirit. On this account, also, it probably was, that of all the articles belonging to the Holy Place, the altar of incense alone was sprinkled with blood on the day of atonement;

as being the highest in order of them all, and the one that held a peculiarly intimate relation to the mercy-seat; hence most fitly taken to represent them all.

The incense, for the presentation of which before the Lord, this altar was erected, was a composition formed of four kinds of sweet spices, stacte, onycha, galbanum, and pure frankincense—of which the latter alone is known with certainty. The composition was made, we have every reason to think, with the view of yielding the most fragrant and refreshing odour. The people were expressly forbidden to use it on any ordinary occasion, and the priests restricted to it alone for burning on the altar—that there might be associated with it a feeling of the deepest sacredness. It possessed the threefold characteristic of "salted (not tempered together, as first in the LXX., and from that transferred into our version, Ex. xxx. 35; see Ainsworth there, and Baehr, i. p. 424,) pure, holy;" that is, having in it a mixture of salt, the symbol of uncorruptness, but otherwise unmixed or unadulterated, and set apart from a common to a sacred use. And the ordinance connected with it was, that when the officiating priest went in to light the lamps in the evening, and again when he dressed the lamps in the morning, he was to place on this golden altar a pot of the prescribed incense, with live coals taken from the altar without, that there might be "a perpetual incense" ascending before the Lord in this apartment of his house.

The meaning of the symbol is indicated with sufficient plainness even in Old Testament scripture, and in perfect accordance with what might have been conjectured from the nature and position of the altar. Thus the Psalmist says, "Let my prayer be set before thee, as the incense," (cxli. 2,) literally, Let my prayer, incense, be set in order before thee, implying that prayer was in the reality, what incense was in the symbol. The action also in Isaiah, vi. 3, 4, where the voice of adoration is immediately followed by the filling of the temple with smoke, proceeds on the same ground; as by the smoke we are doubtless to understand the smoke of the incense, the only thing of that description to be seen there, and which, then, as an appropriate symbol, accompanied the ascription of praise by the cherubim. Passing to New Testament scripture, though still referring to Old Testament times, we find the people without engaged in prayer, while Zacharias was offering incense within (Luke i. 10,) doing in word, what he was doing in action. And in the book of Revelation the prayers of saints are once and again identified with the offering of incense on the golden altar before the throne (Rev. v. 8; viii. 3, 4.*)

* In the last of these passages the incense is said to have been offered "*with* the prayers of saints," whence some have gathered that the two were different, that the incense symbolized only Christ's intercession, and not the prayers of saints. (See, for example, Symington on Atonement and Intercession of Christ, p. 364.) But then in ch. v. 8, the incense is expressly called "the prayers of saints." And it is the usual style of the Apocalypse to couple the symbol with the reality, as, beside the instance before us, the golden candlesticks and the churches, the white linen and the righteousness of the saints, &c.

That the devotional exercises, the prayers of God's faithful people, should have been symbolized by this offering of incense, may possibly carry in the view of many a somewhat arbitrary appearance. Yet there is a very natural connexion between the two, which persons accustomed to the rites of a symbolical worship could have had no difficulty in apprehending. For what are the odours of plants and flowers, but the sweet breath, in a manner, which they exhale? The outgoing, the efflorescence of that fragrant life that is in them? And taking prayer in its largest sense, which we certainly ought to do here, as consisting in the exercise of all devout feeling and spiritual desire toward God—in the due celebration of his adorable perfections—in thanksgiving for the rich and innumerable mercies received from his bountiful hand—in humble supplication for his favour and blessing—if we understand prayer in this wide and comprehensive sense, how can it be more suitably regarded than as the breath of the divine life in the soul? What is it but the pouring out before God, and to God, of the best and holiest affections of the renewed heart? What but the soul's going forth to unite itself in appropriate actings with the great centre of Being, and to devote its own inmost being to him? Of such spiritual sacrifices, it is saying little, that the presentation of them at fitting times is a homage due to God from his redeemed offspring. The permission to offer them is, on their part, a high and ennobling privilege, in the exercise of which they rise to sit in heavenly places with Christ, and occupy the lofty position of princes with God. Nor when done in sincerity and truth, can it ever fail, on God's part, to meet with the warmest reception and most favourable regard. In such breathings of childlike confidence and holy affection, he takes special delight; and the fragrant odours arising from incense of the sweetest spices, could not be more grateful to the bodily sense, than is the sweet-smelling savour of the prayers of saints to the spiritual sense of a gracious God.

But let it be carefully remembered what kind of devotions rise with such acceptance to the sanctuary above. That the altar of incense stood before the Lord, under his immediate eye, intimates that the adorations and prayers he regards must be no formal service, in which the lip rather than the heart is employed; but a felt approach to the presence of the living God, and a real transaction between the soul and Him. That this altar, from its very position, stood in a close relation to the mercy-seat or propitiatory, on the one hand, and by its character and the live coals that ever burned in its golden vials, stood in an equally close relation to the altar of burnt-offering on the other, tells us, that all acceptable prayer must ground itself on the manifested grace of a redeeming God, and draw its breath of life, in a manner, from that blessed work of propitiation, which he has himself provided for the sinful. And since it was ordained that "a perpetual incense before the Lord" should be ever ascending from the altar—since injunctions so strict were given for having the earthly sanctuary made peculiarly and constantly to bear the character of a house of prayer,

most culpably deaf must they be to the voice of instruction that issues from it, if they do not hear enforced on all who belong to the spiritual temple of an elect church, such a lesson as this—Pray without ceasing; the spirit of devotion is the very element of your being; your beginning and ending are alike here; all, from first to last, must be sanctified by prayer; and if this be neglected, neither can you fitly be named a house of God, nor have you any ground to expect the blessing of Heaven on your means of grace and opportunities of usefulness.

THE TABLE OF SHOW-BREAD.

THIS table was made of the same materials as the other articles in the tabernacle—of the same height as the ark of the covenant, but half a cubit narrower in breadth—and as the table was for a service of food, a provision-board, it had connected with it what, in our version are called "dishes, spoons, covers, and bowls," the usual accompaniments of such a table among men. It is proper to notice, however, that these names scarcely suggest what is understood to have been the exact nature and design of the articles in question. What on such a table could be the use of spoons or covers, it is impossible to understand. The rendering accordingly, of these parts of the description may with good reason be inferred to be erroneous, and in regard to the latter of them most certainly was so. Of the four subsidiary articles mentioned, (Ex. xxv. 29,) the first (קערות) were probably a sort of platters for carrying the bread to and from the table, on which also it might stand there; the second (כפות from כף the hollow of the hand,) some sort of hollow cups, or vessels, possibly for the frankincense, (the LXX. have expressly *censers;*) the third and the fourth (קשות) and (מנקיות,) with which the latter, in Ex. xxv. 29, and in Numb. iv. 7, the former, have coupled with them the additional expression "to pour withal," (not to cover withal, as in our version,) were most likely the vessels appropriated for the wine, and are probably rendered with substantial correctness by the LXX. by words corresponding to "bowls and cups." That we cannot fix more determinately the form and use of these inferior utensils, is of little moment; as we can have no doubt that they were simply such as were required for the provisions and services connected with the table itself.

Turning, therefore, to the provisions here presented, the main part, we find, consisted of twelve cakes, which, when placed on the table, were formed into two rows or piles. The twelve, signature of the covenant-people, evidently bore respect to the twelve tribes of Israel, and indicated, that in the symbolical design of these cakes, the whole covenant-people were equally interested and called to take a part. These cakes, as a whole, were called the "show-bread," literally "bread of faces or presence." The meaning of the expression may, without difficulty, be gathered from Ex. xxv. 30, where the Lord himself names it "show-bread before me always;" it was to be continually in his presence, or exhibited before his face, and was hence appropriately designated "show-bread,"

or "bread of presence." The table was never to be without it; and on the return of every Sabbath morning, the old materials were to be withdrawn, and a new supply furnished.

It has been thought, that something more must have been intended by the peculiar designation "bread of presence," than we have now indicated, since, if this were all, the altar of incense and the golden candlestick might, with equal propriety, have been called the altar and candlestick of presence—which, however, they never are (Baehr.) But a special reason can easily be discovered for the peculiar appropriation of this epithet to the bread, viz., to prevent the Israelites from supposing, what they might otherwise, perhaps, in their carnality have done, that this bread was, like bread in general, simply for being eaten; to instruct them, on the contrary, that it was rather for being seen and looked on with complacency by the holy and ever-watchful eye of God. They would thus more easily rise from the natural to the spiritual use, from the symbol to the reality. The bread, no doubt, *was* eaten by the officiating priests each Sabbath; not on the table, however, but only after having been removed from it, and simply because, being most holy, it might not be turned to a profane use, but must be consumed by God's familiars in his own house. As connected with the table, its design was served by being exhibited and seen, for the well-pleased satisfaction and favourable regard of a righteous God; so that it is not possible to conceive a fitter designation than the one given to it, of show-bread, or bread of presence.*

But in what character precisely was this bread laid upon the table? We are furnished with the answer in Lev. xxiv. 8, where it is described as "an offering from the children of Israel by a perpetual covenant;" so much, therefore, taken from their substance, and consecrated to the honour of God. It was, consequently, a kind of sacrifice; and, as the altar of God was in a sense his table, so this table of his in turn possessed somewhat of the nature of an altar;† the provision laid on it had the character of an offering. Hence, also, there was placed upon the top of each of the two rows a vessel with pure frankincense (Lev. xxiv. 7,) which was manifestly designed to connect the offering on the table with the offering on the altar of incense, and to show, that they not only possessed the same general character of offerings presented by the people to the Lord, but also that there existed a near internal relationship between the two: "Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row for the bread, for a memorial (a calling to remembrance, viz. of the covenant-people before the Lord,) an offering

* We have no intention of entering into any express refutation of Baehr's view—who understands by the show-bread that (spiritual) bread by which one comes to see the face of God, the proper food and nourishment of a divine life—as we conceive it to be entirely arbitrary, and utterly at variance with what is said of it as an offering, and an offering from the people to God. Bush, however, follows closely in the footsteps of Baehr, and might, we think, in this as in some other cases, have given his master a little more specific acknowledgment of his obligations to him. As for Baumgarten's opinion, we scarcely know what he precisely means.

† Sicut enim ara mensa Dei, ita mensa Dei ara quædam erat, araque plane vicem præstabat.—Outram, De Sac. L. I. c. 8, § 7.

of fire unto the Lord." Now, the presentation of incense was just, as we have seen, an embodied prayer; and the placing of a vessel of incense upon this bread was like sending it up to God on the wings of devotion. It implied that the spiritual offering symbolized by the bread was to be ever presented with supplication, and only when so presented could it meet with the favour and blessing of Heaven. Thus hallowed and thus presented, the bread became a most sacred thing, and could only be eaten by the priests in the sanctuary; "for it is most holy (a holy of holies) unto him, of the offerings of the Lord, made by fire by a perpetual statute."

It is also to be borne in mind, with the view of helping us to understand the symbolical import of the show-bread, that there was not only frankincense set upon each row, but also a vessel or possibly two vessels of wine placed beside them. This is not, indeed, stated in so many words, but is clearly implied in the mention made of bowls or vessels for "pouring out withal," or making libation with them to God. Wine is well known to have been the kind of drink constantly used for the purpose; and the simple mention of such vessels, for such a purpose, must have been perfectly sufficient to indicate to the priesthood what was meant by this part of the provisions. Still, from the table deriving its name from the bread placed on it, and from the bread alone being specially noticed, we are certainly led to regard it as by much the more important thing, the main part of the provisions, and the wine only as a kind of accessory, or fitting accompaniment. But these two, bread or corn and wine, were always regarded in the ancient world as the primary and leading articles of bodily nourishment, and were most commonly put as the representatives of the whole means of life (Gen. xxvii. 28, 37; Judges xix. 19, Ps. iv. 7; Hag. ii. 12; Luke vii. 33; xxii. 19, 20, &c.) And from the two being placed together on this table, with precisely such a prominence to the bread as properly belongs to it in the field of nature, it is impossible to doubt, that something must have been symbolized here, which bore a respect to the divine life, similar to what these did in the natural.

But the things presented here, we have already shown, possessed the character of an offering to the Lord; if spiritual food was symbolized, it must have been so in respect to him; and how, it will naturally be asked, could his people present any thing to him that might with propriety be regarded as ministering nourishment or support to the all-sufficient God? Not certainly as if he needed any thing from their hands, or could derive actual refreshment from whatever they might be capable of yielding in his service. But we must remember the relation in which Israel stood to God, and he again to Israel—their relation first in respect to what was visible and outward, and then we shall have no difficulty in perceiving, how fitly what was here presented in that lower department of things shadowed forth what was due in respect to things spiritual and divine. The children of the covenant were sojourners with God, in that land which was peculiarly his, and on which his blessing, if they only remained faithful to the covenant, was perpetually

to rest. On their part, they were to obtain bread and wine in abundance for the comfortable support of their bodily natures, as the fruit of their labours in the cultivated fields and luxuriant vineyards of Canaan. And even in this point of view, they owed a return of tribute-money to God, as the absolute Lord and sovereign of the land, in token of their holding all in fief of him, and deriving their increase from the riches of his bounty. This they were called to render in their tithes, and first-fruits, and similar offerings. But as the table of show-bread was part of the furniture of God's house, where all bore a religious and moral character, it is with the spiritual alone we have here to do, and with the outward and natural only as the symbol of that. The children of the covenant had most of all a spiritual relation to fill, as the occupiers of God's territory and the guests of his house; they had a spiritual work to do for the interests of God's kingdom, and in the doing of which they had also from his hand the promise of fruitfulness and blessing. How was such a result to discover itself? What here corresponds to the bread and wine obtained in the province of nature? What but an increase of righteousness, for which the gracious soul ever hungers and thirsts, and which, the more it grows in the divine life, the more must it desire to have realized. But as the divine life exists in its perfection with God, he must also supremely desire the same; he must seek for a becoming return of righteousness from his people, as if it were his necessary food; and with such a spiritual increase they must never leave his house unfurnished. Had they been the subjects of an earthly king, it would have been their part to keep his table replenished with provisions of another kind, suited to the wants of this life; but being a Spirit, infinitely exalted above the pressure of outward necessities, and seeking what is good only from his love to the interests of righteousness, it is their fruitful obedience to his commandments, their abounding in whatsoever things are just, honest, pure, lovely, and of good report, on which, as the very end of all the privileges he had conferred, his soul ever was, as it still is, supremely set; these are the provisions which, as labourers in the kingdom, they must be ever serving on his table; and on these his eye ever rests with holy satisfaction, when sent up with the incense of true devotion from the humble and pious worshipper.

If the whole community of Israel had entered aright into the mind of God, they would, in the ordinance of the show-bread, have seen this to be their calling, and laboured with holy diligence to fulfil it. It was done in reality only by the spiritual portion of the seed, who too frequently formed but a fragment of the whole. To such, however, Cornelius is plainly represented as belonging, even though he had not yet received an outward standing in the community of the faithful, when, in the language of this ordinance, it is said of him, that "his alms-deeds and his prayers came up for a memorial before God"—for a memorial, or bringing to the remembrance of the worshipper for his good, the very description given of the object of the show-bread and its attendant incense. For

God never calls his people to serve him for naught. He seeks from them the fruits of righteousness, only that he may send them in return larger recompenses of blessing. And every act of grace, every deed of righteousness that proceeds from their hands, does for them in the upper sanctuary the part of a remembrancer, putting their Heavenly Father, as it were, in mind of his promises of love and kindness. What encouragement to be faithful! How does God strew the path of obedience with allurements to the practice of every good and pious work! And in proportion to his anxiety in securing these happy results of righteousness and blessing, so must be his disappointment and indignation, when scenes of an opposite kind present themselves to his view. Of this a striking representation was given by the symbolical action of our Lord, in blasting the fig-tree, on which he went to seek, but found no fruit (Matth. xxi. 19,) and in the parables of the barren fig-tree in the vineyard, and of the wicked husbandmen to whom a certain householder let out his vineyard (Luke xiii. 6–9; Matth. xxi. 33–43; comp. also Isa. v. 1–7.)

It is scarcely necessary to add, that the lesson taught in the ordinance of the show-bread speaks with a still louder voice to the Christian, than it could possibly do to the Jewish church; as the gifts of grace conferred now are much larger than formerly, and the revenue of glory which God justly expects to accrue from them, should also be proportionally increased. We accordingly find in New Testament Scripture the strongest calls addressed to believers, urging them to fruitfulness in all righteousness; and every doctrine, as well as every privilege of grace, is plied to the purpose of quickening them to run the way of God's commandments. So much is this the characteristic of the gospel, that its highest demands on the obedience of men come always in connexion with its fullest exhibitions of grace to their souls; and nothing can be more certain than that according as they become subject to its influence, they are effectually taught to "deny themselves to all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in the world."*

THE GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.

This is the only remaining article of sacred furniture in the Holy Place of the tabernacle. Its position was to be on the south side, opposite the table of show-bread, the altar of incense being in the middle, and somewhat nearer to the vail of separation. It was not so properly a candlestick, as a stand or support for lamps. It was ordered to be made with one erect stem in the centre, and on each side three branches rising out of the main stem in regular gradation, and each having at the top a place fitted for holding a lamp, on the same level and of the same construction with the one

* The provisions of the table of show-bread were evidently of the same nature, and carried the same moral import with the meat and drink offerings; and some additional remarks will naturally fall to be made when we treat of these, which may be regarded as supplementary to what has been written before.

in the centre. The material was of solid gold, and of a talent in weight; so that it must have been one of the costliest articles in the tabernacle.

In the description given of the candlestick nothing is said of its height, or of the proportions of its several parts. Both in the stem, however, and in the branches there was to be a threefold ornament wrought into the structure, called "bowls, knops, and flowers." The bowls or cups appear to have been fashioned so as to present some resemblance to the almond-tree (Ex. xxv. 33,) as, in the passage referred to, they are called "almond-shaped cups." The knops or globes are supposed by some, in particular by Baehr, to have been pomegranates; but the word used in the original is not that elsewhere employed for pomegranates, and there is no valid ground for holding such to be the meaning of the term here. That they were some sort of rounded figures is all we can certainly know of them. And from the relative position of the three, according to which the flowers come last, it seems out of place to find in the candlestick a representation of a fruit-bearing tree, with a trunk, and, on each side, three flowering and fruitful branches. We should, at least, proceed on fanciful ground, did we make any thing depend for the interpretation of the symbol on this notion; and for any thing we can see to the contrary, the figures in question may have been designed simply as graceful and appropriate ornaments. Its being of solid gold denoted the excellency of that which it symbolized; and the light it diffused being sevenfold (seven being the signature of the holy covenant, hence of sanctification, holiness,) denoted that all was of an essentially pure and sacred character.

In the lamps on this candlestick Aaron was ordered to burn pure olive oil; but only, it would seem, during the night. For in Ex. xxvii. 21 he is commanded to cause the lamps to burn "from evening to morning before the Lord;" and in ch. xxx. 7, 8, his "dressing the lamps in the morning" is set in opposition to his "lighting them in the evening." The same order is again repeated in Lev. xxiv. 3. And in accordance with this, we read in 1 Sam. iii. 3, of the Lord's appearing to Samuel "before the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord"—which can only mean early in the morning before sunrise. Josephus, indeed, mentions, that the custom was to keep the lamps burning night and day; but this only indicates that the arrangement in the second temple varied from the original constitution. The candlestick appears to have been designed in its immediate use to form a substitute for the natural light of the sun; and it must hence have been intended that the outer vail should be drawn up at break of day, as in ordinary tents, so far as to give light sufficient for any ministrations that might require to be performed in the sanctuary.

This symbol has received such repeated illustration in other parts of Scripture, that there is scarcely any room for difference of opinion as to its fundamental import, and main idea. In the first chapter of Revelation, the image occurs in its original form,

"the seven golden lamps" (not candlesticks, as in our version, but the seven lamps on the one candlestick,) which are explained to mean "the seven churches." These churches, however, not as of themselves, but as replenished by the Spirit of God, and full of holy light and energy; and hence in the 4th chapter of the same book, we again meet with seven lamps of fire before the throne of God, which are said to be "the seven spirits of God"—either the One Spirit of God in his varieties of holy and spiritual working, or seven presiding spirits of light fitted by that Spirit for the ministrations referred to in the heavenly vision. Throughout Scripture—as we have already seen in ch. iii. of this part—oil is uniformly taken for a symbol of the Holy Spirit. It is so, not less with respect to its light-giving property, as to its qualities for anointing and refreshment; and hence the prophet Zechariah, ch. iv., represents the exercise of the Spirit's gracious and victorious energy in behalf of the church, under the image of two olive trees pouring oil into the golden candlestick—the church being manifestly imaged in the candlestick, and the Spirit's assisting grace in the perpetual current of oil, with which it was supplied. Clearly, therefore, what we see in the candlestick of the tabernacle is the church's relation to God as the possessor and reflector of the holy light that is in him, which she is privileged to receive, and bound to give forth so constantly that where she is there must be no darkness, not though all around may be enwrapped in the shades of midnight. She must ever appear to be dwelling in a region of light, and under God the bountiful dispenser of it to others.

But what exactly is meant by darkness and light in this relation? Darkness, in a moral sense, is the element of error, of corruption and sin; the rulers of darkness are the heads and instigators of all malice and wickedness; and the works of darkness are the manifold fruits of unrighteous principle. Light, on the other hand, is the element of moral rectitude, of sound knowledge or truth in the understanding, and holiness in the heart and conduct. The children of light are those who, through the influence of the Spirit of truth, have been brought to love and practise the principles of righteousness; and the deeds of light are such as may stand the examination and receive the approval of God. When of God himself it is said, that "he is light, and in him is no darkness at all," it implies, not only that he is possessed of all spiritual discernment so as to be able to distinguish with unerring precision between the evil and the good, but also that this good itself, in all its principles of truth, and forms of manifestation, this, and this alone, has place in his character and government. And so, when the apostle writes to believers (Eph. v. 8,) "Ye are light in the Lord, walk as children of the light," he immediately adds, with the view at once of explaining and of enforcing the statement, "for the fruit of the Spirit (or of light, as it is now generally read) is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth;" these are the signs and manifestations of spiritual light, and only in so far as your life is distinguished by these, do you prove and verify your title to the name of children of light.

The ordinance, therefore, of the golden candlestick, with its sevenfold light, told the church of that age, tells the church, indeed, of every age, that she must bear the image of God, ever walking in the light of his truth, and shining forth in its holy beauties for the instruction and edification of others. Our Lord virtually gives a voice to the ordinance when he says to his disciples, "Ye are the light of the world; let your light so shine before men, that they seeing your good works may glorify your Father in heaven." Or it may be heard in the stirring address of Isaiah, pointing to Christian times, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord has arisen upon thee:" Now, daughter of Zion, now especially, since He has come who is the life and the light of men, it is day with thee; therefore, not a time to slumber and take thy rest, but to be up and doing in thy Master's service. Self-pleasing inaction, or unhallowed enjoyment, is no privilege in God's kingdom. He has brought to thy hand the richest talents of grace, not that they may be wrapt up in a napkin, but faithfully laid out for the glory of him who conferred them. Arise, therefore, and shine; reflect the light which has shone from heaven upon thy soul; give forth true and living manifestations of that glory which the Spirit of glory has poured around thy spiritual condition: and as that light is all holy light, and that glory peculiarly consists in the revelation of God's pure and blessed character in the face of Jesus Christ, this high calling is fulfilled only in so far as the life and the power of godliness manifest themselves in thy walk and conduct.*

* Throughout the whole of this chapter I have avoided referring to the interpretations of the older typologists, or the run of commentators. It would have taken us too long to expose every error, and it seemed better to notice none till we had unfolded what we conceive to be the correct view of the several parts. And this, we trust, has appeared so natural, and is so fully borne out by the language of Scripture, that the contrary opinions may be allowed to remain unnoticed. Indeed, nothing more is needed than to look at them, to see how uncertain and unsatisfactory they commonly are even to those who propound them. Baehr, indeed, speaks dogmatically enough, although his fundamental error regarding the general design of the tabernacle, formerly referred to, carried him here also for the most part in the wrong direction. But take, for example, what Scott says in his commentary regarding the show-bread, which may be paralleled by many similar explanations: "They (the cakes) might typify Christ, as the bread of life and the continual food of the souls of his people, having offered himself unto God for them; or they may denote the services of believers, presented before God through him and accepted for his sake; or, the whole may mean the communion betwixt our reconciled Father and his adopted children in Christ Jesus, who, as it were, feast at the same table," &c. What can any one make of this diversity of meaning? When the mind is treated to so many and such different notions under one symbol, it necessarily takes in none distinctly; they become merely so many perhaps's; and instead of multiplying the benefit and instruction of the ordinance, we only deprive it of any certain sound whatever.—The ground of most of the erroneous interpretations on the furniture and services of the Holy Place, lay in understanding all directly and peculiarly of Christ. It is not to be forgotten, however, that viewing him as the Head, the Pattern, and Forerunner of his people, every thing that was here shadowed forth concerning them is true in a higher and pre-eminent sense of him. His prayers, his work of righteousness, and his exhibition of the light of divine truth and holiness, take precedence of all that in a like kind ever has been, or ever may be, presented by the members of his body. But as Christ's whole undertaking is something *sui generis*, and chiefly to be viewed as the means of salvation and access to heaven, provided by God for them,—as under this view it was already symbolized in the furniture and services of the

CHAPTER VII.

THE OFFERINGS AND SERVICES CONNECTED WITH THE BRAZEN ALTAR IN THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE—SIN-OFFERINGS—TRESPASS-OFFERINGS—BURNT-OFFERINGS—PEACE OR THANK-OFFERINGS—MEAT-OFFERINGS.

WE found it necessary, before entering on the consideration of the particular apartments and furniture of the tabernacle, to examine the relation in which the whole stood to the altar of burnt-offering in the court, and this we found it impossible properly to explain, without investigating the fundamental idea of sacrifice, as expressed in the more important acts and operations connected with it. What was said there must here be taken for granted and kept in recollection. It was common to all sacrifices of blood that there was in them, on the part of the offerer, a remembrance of sin, and, on the part of God, a provision made for his reconciliation and pardon. The death of the animal represented the desert due to him for sin, the wages of which is death. God's appointing the life-blood of his own guiltless creature to be shed for such a purpose, and afterwards sprinkled on his altar, denoted that he accepted this symbolically as an atonement or substitution for the life of the guilty offerer, and typically implied that he would in due time provide and accept a real atonement or substitution in Christ. In so far as the ancient believer might present the blood of his sacrifice according to the manner prescribed, and in so far as the believer now appropriates by faith the atoning blood of Christ, in each case alike the blessed result is—he is justified from sin, and has peace with God.

But it is evident, on a moment's consideration, that while the things now mentioned form what must have been the fundamental and most essential part of every sacrifice, various other things, of a collateral and supplementary kind, were necessarily required to bring out the whole truth connected with the sinner's reconciliation and restored fellowship with God, as also to give suitable expression to the diversified feelings and affections, which it became him at different times to embody in his acts of worship. If any thing like a complete representation was to be given by means of sacrifice of the sinner's relation to God, there must, at least, have been something in the appointed rites to indicate the different degrees of guilt, the sense entertained by the sinner, not only of his own sinfulness, but also of his obligations to the mercy of God for restored peace, his several states of comparative distance from God

Most Holy Place, it is better and more agreeable to the design of the tabernacle, to consider the things belonging to the Holy Place as directly referring only to the works and services of Christ's people.

and nearness to him, and the manifold consequences, both in respect to his condition and his character, growing out of his acceptable approach to God. This could no otherwise be done than by the institution of different kinds of sacrifice, suited to the ever varying circumstances of the worshipper; or by the different kinds of victims employed in the same sacrifice, the particular actions with their blood, the use made of their several parts, or the supplementary services with which the offering of them was accompanied. In these respects, opportunity was afforded for the symbolical expression of a very considerable variety of states and feelings. And it was, more particularly, by its minute prescriptions and diversified arrangements for this purpose, that the Mosaic ritual formed so decided an improvement on the sacrificial worship of the ancient world. Before the time of Moses, this species of worship was comparatively vague and indefinite in its character. There appear to have been at most but two distinct forms of sacrifice, and these probably but slightly varied—the burnt-offering and the peace-offering. That such distinctions did exist, as to constitute two kinds of sacrifice under these respective appellations, seems unquestionable, from mention being made of both at the ratification of the covenant (Ex. xxiv. 5,) prior to the introduction of the peculiar distinctions of the Mosaic ritual; and also from the indications that exist in earlier times of a feast in connexion with certain sacrifices, while it was always the characteristic of the burnt-offering, that the whole was consumed by fire. But the line of demarkation between the two probably limited itself to the participation or non-participation on the part of the offerers of a portion of the sacrifice, leaving whatever else might require to be indicated respecting the state or feelings of the worshipper, to be either expressed in words, or to exist only in the silent consciousness of his own mind.

It is apparently on account of this greater antiquity and more general character of the burnt and peace-offerings, that they take precedence in the prescriptions given in Leviticus concerning the sacrifices. The priority in point of order, after the Mosaic ritual was introduced, belonged, however, not to them, but to the sin-offerings; and, accordingly on those occasions, when a series of offerings was presented, the sin-offerings invariably came first (Ex. xxix.; Lev. v., viii., ix., xvi., &c.) The change introduced by the giving of the law was the cause of this. The law necessarily brought with it the knowledge of sin. It did not, indeed, originate such knowledge; but it imparted much clearer views, and produced a far deeper consciousness of sin, than generally existed before its promulgation. And as consciousness of sin is the foundation and starting-point of all sacrifice, that kind of sacrifice in which the ideas of sin and atonement were brought most prominently out, was fitly regarded as holding the first place in the sacrificial system. With it, therefore, we begin.

THE SIN-OFFERING.

THIS species of sacrifice has so peculiarly to do with sin, that its very name is identified with it (חטאת;) in Hebrew, the common term for sin is also the term for sin-offering. This clearly indicates that it has specially to do with sin, and aims at atonement, in the most explicit and definite sense. This, we have already seen, was peculiarly the case with the sin-offerings presented on the day of atonement for the priesthood and the people. And in respect to ordinary occasions, they primarily differed from the other sacrifices, that they were connected with some *special acts* of sin (Lev. iv.–v.–13.*) But in the description given of these occasions there are two peculiarities, from which the opponents of a vicarious atonement have often sought to invalidate that vital doctrine. The first peculiarity has respect to the prominence given to merely bodily and external defilements: such as touching the carcass of an unclean person or beast. But that these are far from being alone, or even chiefly intended—that the notice taken of them rather forms a supplementary direction, lest the people should think such comparatively small offences were not included, must be evident to every one, who reads attentively the whole section, and compares the portion v. 1–13, where alone such sins are specified, with the preceding chapter, where there is no specification of particular sins, and where the only description given, repeated each time in regard to the priest, the congregation, the ruler, and the private individual, is of sins committed "against *any* of the commandments of God." In an economy which had the decalogue for the root and basis of all its legislation, it is impossible but that, under such a description, transgressions of a religious-moral nature must have been, not only included, but even mainly and primarily intended.

The other peculiarity has respect to the manner in which the sins have been committed, described as "through ignorance," (בשגגה, *bishgagah*,) unawares, or unwittingly. This has been thought by some to imply that the sins referred to could scarcely be transgressions in the strictly moral, but only in a kind of accidental or ceremonial sense, and that sin-offerings being appointed only for such, it argues nothing as to the mind of God regarding transgressions of a properly moral nature. But this view proceeds on an entire misapprehension of the proper force of the original expression. It does include sins, indeed, committed in the ordinary sense through ignorance, while the transgressor, as it is said, "wist not" that he was transgressing. But even in such cases, the ignorance for the most part must itself have been culpable, arising

* The whole of this portion treats of the sin-offerings, and only at v. 14 does the law of the trespass-offering begin. The division of the chapters here is particularly unhappy. That the word *trespass* is sometimes used in the first part of the fifth chapter, arises from these two kinds of offering having much in common, and in particular from the circumstance that every sin for which a sin-offering was to be presented, might be called a trespass, in the sense meant by the original. But of this afterwards, under the trespass-offering.

from that want of care and watchfulness, which those were strictly bound to exercise, who had God's law revealed to them, that they might avoid all occasions of offence. Hence even the fearful sin of the Jews in crucifying our Lord, is said to have been "done ignorantly," (Acts iii. 17;) and the lusts of a corrupt and depraved nature generally are called in 1 Peter i. 14, "the lusts in ignorance." The expression, therefore, as Archbishop Magee justly infers,* "besides sins of ignorance, includes likewise all such as were the consequence of human frailty and inconsideration, whether committed knowingly and wilfully or otherwise. It stands opposed to sins committed 'with a high hand,' (Numb. xv. 22–28,) that is, deliberately and presumptuously, for which no atonement was admitted. So that the efficacy of the atonement was extended to all sins which flowed from the infirmities and passions of human nature; and was withheld only from those which sprang from a deliberate and audacious defiance of the divine authority. This view is also abundantly confirmed by the examples given of the particular sins which called for the atonement, and among which fraud, lying, rash swearing or perjury, licentiousness, are to be found."

But still, perhaps, it may be thought, that even when the limits are thus extended within which provision was made for the atonement and pardon of sin, the provision was greatly deficient, and gave but a feeble exhibition of the mercy and goodness of God—since all, who had gone in the course of transgression beyond the limits in question, had the fearful doom pronounced against them, "they shall be cut off from their people." But it must be remembered, the whole had respect to a people in covenant with God; the mercies he provided for them in his institutions of grace, were covenanted mercies, such as by the handwriting of God they had a right and privilege to claim. And if the boon had been extended beyond the limits specified—if the deliberate and audacious offender had been included in the provision for pardon, what a license would inevitably have been given to transgression? How would the sinner have encouraged and hardened himself in his ways of iniquity, if he could have reckoned on the forgiveness of God, on presenting what he could so easily procure, a kid of the goats for a sin-offering? Indeed, the grand aim and scope of the whole dispensation, "be ye holy, for I am holy," would speedily have gone into oblivion, unless the covenant had excluded presumptuous sins from the benefit of its provisions of mercy. It is certainly possible, that persons, who had been guilty of such sins, might sometimes actually obtain mercy, and be brought to repentance and peace. But in so far as this might be the experience of any, their case lay without the circle of God's ordinary dealings; the mercy extended to them was not covenanted, but peculiar, extraordinary in its nature, and we may reasonably infer singularly rare also in its exercise; for their state of mind was that

* On Atonement, 37th note, where this point is very ably and satisfactorily argued; see also Hengstenberg on Ps. xix. 13, and Outram, de Sac. L. i. 13, § 4.

which God usually abandons to its own lusts, the state of him, of whom it is written: "He that hardeneth his neck shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy."

The principle, on which this part of the divine procedure was based, was by no means peculiar to Judaism, but reappears in Christianity, and, indeed, in a still more severe and awful form: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy, of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" "There is a sin unto death, I do not say that ye shall pray for it"—the sin, namely, of a wilful, obstinate, heaven-daring opposition to the ways of God, and the demands of righteousness, and which, under a dispensation of grace, can usually belong only to such as have grieved the Spirit of God, till he has finally left them:—A sin, therefore, which lies beyond the province of mercy and forgiveness. There are miracles of grace, which God may possibly work even upon such, without giving any account of his matters; but we may rest assured that they are as rare in their occurrence as they are singular in their character, and it were the height of presumption to expect them.

That there was to be, in this respect, no essential difference in principle between the Old and the New Testament dispensations, was rendered manifest at the commencement of the latter, by the judgment inflicted on Ananias and Sapphira for their deliberate sin regarding the purchase-money of their possession. This may fairly be considered to parallel the case of the presumptuous Sabbath-breaker, at the commencement of the former dispensation (Numb. xv.,)—viewed as an expression of the mind of God respecting the desert of transgression. But with the change of dispensation, a corresponding change was introduced as to the part which the church was to take in dealing with such cases. In Old Testament times, when all was ordered with the view of presenting an outward and symbolical representation of a perfect state—the land, the Lord's inheritance, and all its inhabitants, his redeemed, covenant-people—the presumptuous offender could not be suffered to live; and if he did not himself make his escape from the sacred territory, the congregation must with their own hand make good his excision from their number by the punishment of death. But that punishment, under such a dispensation, was the image of eternal death, which is the full and proper recompense of the presumptuous and impenitent transgressor. And the New Testament church having this future judgment clearly disclosed to it, as ready to be executed by God himself upon such, she is justly withheld from the execution of that outward shadow of the doom; if it may still at times fitly come into execution, the bolt of Omnipotence itself must give the stroke. But the church has no longer to wield the carnal sword; her part is simply to bring sinners into the fold of Christ, and with such as may sin wilfully after having come there and re-

ceived the knowledge of the truth, to cast them out from her pale as an unclean thing—thus delivering them over, as irrecoverable by the ordinary means of grace, to the region where Satan, not the Spirit of God works, that they may there wait the execution of God's final judgment—unless, by some miracle of grace, he should still awaken them to repentance, (Heb. x. 26; 1 Cor. v. 2, 6, 13; 1 Tim. i. 20.) Such is an outline of what may be called the divine order, under both dispensations respectively. But the imperfections connected with their human administration have in each case alike prevented it from being properly realized. In former times, there would sometimes be a difficulty, even where there was a willingness, to determine exactly whether a transgression was really of the kind for which no atonement was provided; and the spirit of unfaithfulness, which so generally characterized the more influential members of the covenant, would naturally manifest itself in an aversion to execute the sentence written. Hence, in the history, we find so many traces of those being suffered to live, and even to hold a leading place in the counsels of the nations, who, by the terms of the law, should have been cut off from the people of the Lord. And in the church of the New Testament, how extensively a similar spirit of defection and unfaithfulness has prevailed in respect to her correlative department of duty, is unhappily a matter of too flagrant notoriety.*

To return now to the sin-offering appointed to be made for such cases of transgression as admitted of atonement—we are met, in the first instance, with a diversity in the victims—a gradation in value, which was evidently intended to mark the more or less offensive character of the sin to be atoned. When the sin was that of a private member of the congregation, the offering was to be a female kid of the goats (for which in cases of poverty a substitute was allowed of two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, and where the poverty was extreme, a little flour.) For a ruler, the offering was to be a male kid; for the congregation and the High-priest, on ordinary occasions, a young bullock; but on the great day of atonement, when the sin-offering of the congregation consisted of two goats, that of the High-priest was a bullock; because, not only representing the people in his official capacity, but also standing in a relation of peculiar nearness to God, his sins possessed a darker and more aggravated character. There was thus perpe-

* If the view here given be properly attended to, there will be no difficulty in perceiving the mistaken and groundless nature of the contrast so often drawn between Judaism and Christianity, as if the one were all severity, and the other all mercy, as if a spirit of judgment belonged to the one, to which there is nothing corresponding in the other. Judaism could not in that case have formed a fitting preparation for Christianity. And then, what can be made of such declarations in New Testament scripture itself, as throw the balance entirely on the other side: "More tolerable for Tyre and Sidon"—"if every transgression of disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall *we* escape?" "of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy," &c. There is a real correspondence between the dispensations: in both alike an excision for the deliberate, presumptuous offender—but that manifesting itself in the one case by the infliction of temporal death, in the other by the delivering up of the offender to the judgment of eternal death.

tually brought out in connexion with the means of atonement, the solemn truth, that while all sin is so offensive in the sight of Heaven, as to deserve the penalty of death, it grows in offensiveness with the rank and number of the transgressors; and that so far from there being in God's kingdom any such partiality, as might infer a privilege of sinning, the higher always one's standing there, the greater is the Divine displeasure and judgment against the iniquity committed. Hence also the word by Ezekiel, ix. 6: "Slay utterly old and young, and *begin* at my sanctuary."

But the chief and most distinctive peculiarity in this species of sacrifice was the action with the blood, which, though variously employed, was always used so as to give a relatively strong and intense expression to the ideas of sin and atonement. When the offering had respect to a single individual, a ruler or a private member of the congregation, the blood was not simply to be poured round about the altar, but some of it also to be sprinkled upon the horns of the altar—its prominent points, its insignia, as they might be called, of honour and dignity. But if it was for the sin of the High-priest, or of the congregation at large, besides these actions in the outer court, a portion of the blood was to be carried into the Sanctuary, where the priest was to sprinkle with his finger seven times before the inner vail, and again upon the horns of the altar of incense. It was to be done in the Holy Place, before the vail, because that was the symbolical dwelling-place of the High-priest, or of the congregation as represented by him; and upon the altar of incense, in particular, because that was the most important article of furniture there, and one also that stood, as already noticed, in a near relation to the altar of burnt-offering. A still higher expression, and the last, the highest expression which could be given of the ideas in question by means of the blood, was presented when the High-priest on the day of atonement went with the blood of his own and the people's sin-offering into the Most Holy Place, and sprinkled the mercy-seat—the very place of Jehovah's throne. In this action the sin appeared on the one hand, rising to its most dreadful form of a condemning witness in the presence-chamber of God, and, on the other, the atonement assumed the appearance of so perfect and complete a satisfaction, that the sinner could come nigh to the seat of God, and return again, not only unscathed, but with a commission from him to banish the entire mass of guilt into the gulf of utter oblivion.

It is from the peculiar character of the sin-offering as God's special provision for removing the guilt of sin—from what might be called the intensely atoning power of its blood, that the other arrangements arose, which were made concerning it. The blood was so sacred, that if any portion of it should by accident have come upon the garments of the persons officiating, the garment, "whereon it was sprinkled, was to be washed in the Holy Place," (Lev. vi. 27,) it must not be carried out on that beyond the proper region of consecrated things. The flesh was not consumed upon the altar —the fat alone was burned, as being the most excellent part, the

fittest to be set apart immediately for God, (Gen. xxvii. 28, xlv. 18; Ps. lxxxi. 16; Numb. xviii. 12, &c.,) and though the kidneys and the caul above the liver, or rather the greater lobe of the liver, which had the caul attached to it, are also mentioned as parts to be burnt, yet it was simply from their being so closely connected with the fat, that they were regarded as in a manner one with it (whence in Lev. iii. 16, vii. 30, 31, all the parts actually burnt are called simply the *fat.*)* But while the flesh itself was not consumed upon the altar, it was declared to be most holy, and could be eaten by none but the officiating priests, and by them only within the sacred precincts of the tabernacle. And if the vessel in which it was prepared was earthen, receiving as it must then have done a portion of the substance, it was required to be broken, as too sacred to be henceforth applied to a common use; or if of brass, it was ordered to be scoured and rinsed in water, that not even the smallest fragment of flesh so holy might come in contact with common things, or be carried beyond the bounds of the sanctuary. This eating by the priesthood of the flesh of the sin-offering, however, is said to have been done, not simply because it was most holy, but "also that they might bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord," (Lev. x. 17.) This cannot mean, that the flesh of the sin-offering still had the iniquities of the people, as it were, inhering in it, and that the priests, by devouring the one, made finally away with the other. In that case, the flesh must rather have been regarded as most polluted, instead of being most holy. But the atonement in the strict and proper sense was made, when, after the imposition of hands, the penalty of death was inflicted on the victim, and its blood sprinkled on the altar of God. This denoted that its life-blood was not only given, but also accepted by God in the room of the sinful. And the eating of the flesh by the priests as at once God's familiars, and the people's representatives, could only be intended to give a symbolical representation of the completeness of the reconciliation—to show by their incorporation with the sacrifice, how entirely through it the guilt had been removed, and the means of removing it converted even into the sustenance of the holiest life. The "bearing of the iniquity," therefore, was bearing, not in reference to guilt, but in reference to expiation, bearing it away as forgiven, and exhibiting the perfected result of the atonement. It was just doing in another form substantially what was done by the action with the live goat on the day of atonement.†

* This explanation of the fat and adjoining parts, which is now generally adopted, we regard as much more natural and consistent than the one formerly maintained by most Christian divines, and supported by some Jewish authorities, viz., that the fat was the emblem of corruption, and the inward parts of the seat of human depravity. In that case, the whole inwards must always have been burnt, and especially the whole liver and the heart—which was not the case. Why not also the bowels as the seat of feeling and affection? But the interpretation went entirely on a wrong ground —when the animal was killed, the curse was abolished, the relative impurity gone—and not the worst, but the best was fittest to be given to the Lord.

† The older, and, indeed, most also of the recent typologists completely misunderstood this eating of the flesh of the sin-offering, regarding it as a kind of eating of the sin, and so bearing it, or making it their own. See, for example, Gill on Lev. x. 17,

But it was only in the case of sin-offerings for the private member, or the single ruler in the congregation, that the flesh was to be eaten by the priesthood; in those cases in which the blood was carried within the sanctuary, that is, when the offering had respect to a sin of the High-priest, or of the congregation at large—with whom as the public representative he was nearly identified—then the flesh was appointed to be carried without the camp, and burnt in a clean place (ch. iv. 12, 21; vi. 30.) These being sacrifices of a higher value, and bearing on them a stamp of still greater sacredness than those whose flesh was eaten by the priesthood, the injunction not to eat of it here, but to carry it without the camp and burn it, could not, as Baehr remarks (ii. p. 397,) have arisen from any impurity supposed to reside in the flesh. It is true, that all impure things were ordered to be carried out of the camp, but it does not follow from this, that every thing taken without the camp was impure; and in this case it was expressly provided, that the place to which the flesh was brought, should be *clean*, implying that it was itself *pure*. The arrangement both as to the not eating, and the burning without the camp, seems to have arisen from the nature and object of the offering. In the cases referred to, the High-priest was himself concerned, directly or indirectly, in the atonement, and could not properly partake of the flesh of the victim, as this would have given it the character of a peace-offering. The flesh, as well as the blood, must therefore be given to the Lord. But it could not be burnt on the altar, for this would have given it the character of a burnt-offering; neither could there in that case have been so clear an expression of the idea which was here to be rendered prominent, viz., the completeness of the satisfaction, and the entire removal of the iniquity. This was best done by the carrying of the carcass to a clean place without the camp, and consuming it there as a holy of holies to the Lord; for as all in the camp had to do with it, it was thus taken apart from them all, and out of sight of all devoted by fire to the Lord.*

Bush on ib. and ch. vi. 30; also Deyling, Obs. Sac. i. sect. 65, § 2. It was thought in this way to afford the best adumbration of Christ, whom the priests typified, being made a sin for his people, or taking their guilt upon his own person and bearing it away. But it proceeds upon a wrong foundation, and utterly confounds the proper relation of things; the flesh as holy, and appointed to be eaten, must have represented the acceptableness or completeness of the sacrifice, not the sinfulness of the sin atoned. Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 182, 183.

* The same fundamental error here also pervades most of the typical interpretations, which generally proceed on the supposition of the flesh being still charged with sin, and very commonly regard the consuming of it with fire as representing, either the intense suffering of Christ, or the personal sufferings of the lost hereafter. Besides going on a wrong supposition, this notion is still farther objectionable on account of its deriving the idea of suffering from what was absolutely incapable of feeling it. The dead carcass was unconscious alike both of pain and pleasure; and then, as it was entirely consumed, if referring to Christ, it must have signified his absolutely perishing under the curse,—if to the lost sinner, his annihilation by the sufferings.—The reference made in Heb. xiii. 11, to the burning of the carcass of the sin-offerings without the camp, is in perfect accordance with the explanation given above. "For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high-priest for sin (*i. e.* the sin-offerings,) are burned without the camp; wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate; let us, therefore," &c. It is rather an allusion to the rite than an explicit and proper

The only additional regulation regarding the sin-offering was, that of no meat or drink offering accompanying it; and in those cases of extreme poverty, in which an offering of flour was allowed to be presented, instead of the pigeons or the goat, no oil or frankincense was to be put on it, "for it is a sin-offering," (ch. v. 11.) The meaning of this is correctly given by Kurtz: "Oil and incense symbolized the Spirit of God and the prayer of the faithful; the meat-offering always good works; but these are then only good works and acceptable to God, when they proceed from the soil of a heart truly sanctified, when they are yielded and matured by the Spirit of God, and when, farther, they are presented to God as his own work in man, accompanied on the part of the latter with the humble and grateful acknowledgment, that the works are the offspring not of his own goodness but of the grace of God. The sin-offering, however, was pre-eminently the atonement-offering; the idea of atonement came so prominently out, that no room was left for the others. The consecration of the person, and the presentation of his good works to the Lord, had to be reserved for another stage in the sacrificial institute."*

[The occasions on which the private and personal sin-offerings were presented, beside those mentioned in Lev. iv. and v., were: when a Nazarite had touched a dead corpse, or when the time of his vow was completed (Numb. vi. 10–14;) at the purification of the leper (Lev. xiv. 19–31,) and of women after long-continued hemorrhage or after child-birth (Lev. xii. 6–8; xv. 25–30,) pointing to the corruption, not only indicated by the bodily disease, but also strictly connected with the powers and processes of generation—the fountain-head, as they might be called, of human depravity. This also accounts for the case mentioned in Lev. xv. 2, 14, being an occasion for presenting a sin-offering; as it does also for the relative impurity connected in so many ways with the same, even where an atonement was not actually required, but washing only enjoined.]

THE TRESPASS-OFFERING.

That the trespass, or as it should rather be called, the guilt or debt-offering (אשם *asham*,) stood in a very near relation to the sin-

interpretation of it. The real city, to which God's people belong, and out of which Christ suffered, is heaven, as the inspired writer, indeed, intimates in v. 14. But the overruling providence of God so ordered matters, that there should be an image of this in the place of Christ's suffering as compared with the earthly Jerusalem. In his case it was designed to be a mark of infamy, to make him suffer without the gate—a sign that he could not be the Messiah. But viewed in reference to the ancient type it proved rather the reverse, as in addition to all the proper and essential marks of agreement between the two, it served to provide even a formal and external resemblance. Though the bodies of those sin-offerings were burnt without the camp, they were still a holy of holies to the Lord; they did not on that account become a polluted thing; and Christ's having, in like manner, suffered without the gate, though certainly designed by men to exhibit him as an object of ignominy and shame, did not render him the less the holy child of God, whose blood could fitly be taken into the highest heavens. But if he suffered himself to be cast out, that he might bear our doom, it surely would ill become us to be unwilling to go out and bear his reproach. This is the general idea; but the passage is rather of the hortatory than the explanatory kind, and passes so rapidly from one point to another, that to press each particular closely would be to make it yield a false and inconsistent meaning.

* Mosaische Opfer., p. 192.

offering, and to a great extent was identified with it in nature, is evident from the description given of the trespass-offering in Lev. v. 14—vi. 7, and in particular from the declaration in ch. vii. 7, "as the sin-offering is, so is the trespass-offering, there is one law for them." But great difficulty has been found in drawing precisely the line of demarkation between the two kinds of offerings, and in pointing out, regarding the trespass-offering, what constituted the specific difference between it and the sin-offering. The difficulty, if not altogether caused, has been very much increased, by the mistake adverted to in a preceding note, of supposing the directions regarding the trespass-offering to begin with ch. v., whereas they really commence with the new section at ver. 14, where, as usual, the new subject is introduced with the words: "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying." These words do not occur at the beginning of the chapter itself; the section to the end of the 13th verse was added to the preceding chapter regarding the sin-offering, with the view of specifying certain occasions on which it should be presented, and making provision for a cheaper sort of sacrifice to persons in destitute circumstances. But in each case the sacrifice itself, without exception, is called a sin-offering, v. 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12. In one verse, indeed, (the 6th) it is said in our version, "And he shall bring his trespass-offering;" but this is a mere mis-translation, and should have been rendered, as it is in the very next verse, where the expression in the original is the same: "And he shall bring for his trespass." Throughout the section the sin is denominated an *asham*, that is, a matter of guilt or debt; and all sin is such, viewed in reference to the law of God, so that every sin-offering might also be called an *asham*, as well as a *hattah*, or sin-offering. But what were distinctively called by the name of *asham*, were offerings for sins, in which the offence given, or the debt incurred by the misdeed, admitted of some sort of estimation and recompense, so that in addition to the atonement required for the iniquity, in the one point of view, there might also, in the other, be the exaction and the payment of a restitution.

That this is the real import of the *asham* as distinguished from the *hattah* or sin, is clear from the passage Numb. v. 5–8, where the former is marked as a consequence of the latter, and such a consequence as admitted and demanded a material recompense. "When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit to do a trespass (or deal fraudulently) against the Lord, and that person be guilty (אשמה) then they shall confess their sin which they have done, and he shall recompense his *asham* with the principal thereof, and add to it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed (literally, to whom he has become guilty.) But if the man have no kinsman to recompense the *asham* unto, let the *asham* be recompensed unto the Lord, to the priest, besides the ram of the atonement, whereby an atonement shall be made for him." The Lord in this latter case, as being the original proprietor of the land, stept into the room of the deceased person who had sustained the injury, and received through his represen-

tative, the priest, the earthly restitution, while the sacrifice was also given to the Lord for the offence committed against his authority. The particular cases specified in ch. vi. 1–5, as coming within the law of the trespass-offering, were entirely of this kind; they implied a civil wrong to certain individuals or the commonwealth: False swearing in regard to any pledge or property delivered into one's hands by a neighbour, finding lost property and lying concerning it, violently taking away, or acting with deceit toward a neighbour's goods. Another set of cases are referred to in the preceding chapter, ver. 15, 16, called trespasses in regard to the holy things of the Lord, which, though no specific instances are given, may be inferred to have been offences of a similar nature in the ecclesiastical province: such as, not paying full tithes, or first-fruits, or withholding in any way from the Lord's representatives some portion of their due gains. In all such cases, a debt was manifestly incurred; and, indeed, a twofold debt: A debt, first of all, to the Lord as the only supreme Head of the commonwealth whose laws had been transgressed, and a debt also to a party on earth whose constitutional rights had been invaded. In both respects alike the priest was to make an estimate of the wrong done: and in the first respect, the debt (whatever might be the valuation) was discharged by the presentation of a ram for the *asham* or trespass-offering, ver. 15; while in the other, the actual sum was to be paid to the party wronged, with an additional fifth.

The same limitations as to the manner of committing the sins in question, were evidently intended to apply here, as in respect to those for which the sin-offering was presented. They were such as had been done in ignorance, unawares, through the influence of passion or temptation; and it is plain, that those most distinctly specified could not possibly have been committed without a consciousness of sin at the very time of their being done. But the precise aspect under which the sins were considered, was taken from a lower point of view, than in the case of the sin-offering. It was a reckoning for and dealing with sin, not precisely in respect to its own nature, but rather in respect to the evils growing out of it; not in its higher and primary relations, but in such only as were subordinate and earthly, and admitted of a sort of reparation. Hence, also, as an atonement, the trespass-offering appears in quite an inferior place to that of the sin-offering; the blood was only poured around the altar, not sprinkled on the horns, nor carried within the sanctuary; and on those more public and solemn occasions, on which a whole series of offerings was to be presented, we never find the trespass-offering taking the place of the sin-offering, or occurring in addition to it (Ex. xxix.; Lev. xvi.; Numb. vii., xxviii., xxix.) So that the trespass-offering may justly be regarded as a kind of appendage to the sin-offering, designed only for such cases as were peculiarly fitted for enforcing upon the sinner's conscience the moral debt he had incurred by his transgression in the reckoning of God, and the necessity of his at once ren-

dering satisfaction to the divine justice he had offended, and making restitution in regard to the brotherly relations he had violated.*

There can be little doubt that this more restricted and inferior character of the trespass-offering is the reason why in New Testament Scripture the one great sacrifice of Christ is never spoken of with special reference to it, while so often presented under the aspect of a sin-offering. We find there, however, mention frequently enough made of sin as a debt incurred toward God, rendering the sinner liable to the exaction of a suitable recompense to the offended justice of Heaven. This satisfaction it is possible for him to pay only in the person of his substitute, the Lamb of God, whose blood is so infinitely precious, that it is amply sufficient to cancel in behalf of every believer the guilt of numberless transgressions. But while this one ransom alone can satisfy for man's guilt the injured claims of God's law of holiness; wherever the sin committed assumes the form of a wrong done to a fellow-creature, God justly demands as an indispensable condition of his granting an acquittal in repect to the higher province of righteousness, that the sinner show his readiness to make reparation in this lower province, which lies within his reach. He who refuses to put himself on right terms with an injured fellow-mortal, can never be received into terms of peace and blessing with an offended God. And if he should even proceed so far as to bring his gift to the altar, while he there remembers that his brother has somewhat against him, he must not presume to offer it, as he should then offer it in vain, but go and render due satisfaction to his brother, and then come and offer the gift.

But while ample materials exist in New Testament Scripture, for bringing out the truth of God under these aspects and relations, the predominant and only direct reference, as regards the relation of Christ's work to these closely affiliated sacrifices, is to the sin-offering. And to this most of all, as we have already seen, in connexion with the services of the day of atonement, when the leading ideas symbolized by this department of the sacrificial rites, obtained their most solemn and striking representation. Having had occasion to open out that more special and perfect representation, little of an additional nature remains now to be supplied from the general prescriptions regarding the sin-offering. But as each individual, even the most private member of the congregation, as well as the congregation at large and the High-priest, was obliged, on being convicted by his conscience of any particular sin, to come with a sin-offering, we see there impressively disclosed the need, in which every sinner stands of the salvation of Christ, and the necessity of making application to it as often as the guilt of sin

* It seems quite unaccountable that Hengstenberg should have assigned the higher place to the trespass-offerings (Authen. ii. p. 216, ss.) We conceive Baehr to be unquestionably right in this particular, however little we can agree with him in many others regarding these offerings. Kurtz concurs in the same view. It is needless to refer to older writers. The only occasions of a private kind, on which both a sin-offering and a trespass-offering appear to have been presented, were at the cleansing of the leper and the Nazarite—of which afterwards.

renews itself upon his conscience. This resort of faith to the perfect sacrifice of Christ is the one way that lies open for the sinner's attainment of pardon, and restoration to peace.

And then in the sacrifice itself there is the reality of that incomparable worth and preciousness, which was so significantly represented in the sin-offering by the sacredness of its blood, and the hallowed destination of its flesh. With reference to this, the blood of Christ is called emphatically "the precious blood," and "the blood that cleanseth from all sin." "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Holy and without blemish in himself, and infinitely dear to the Father as his only begotten and well-beloved Son, he yet became, when he took upon him the iniquities of us all, in the sight of Heaven—SIN, one grand impersonation of guilt—as the sin-offering was, after the offerer had confessed over it, with imputation of hands, the sin of which he had been guilty, and received the infliction of the penalty that was due. But as soon as this awful penalty was borne by the Redeemer, the moment he could say in regard to what was exacted of him, "It is finished," as the curse was then exhausted, so the guilt that deserved it was finally and for ever borne away; the Lamb of God, formerly charged with a world's guilt, is henceforth in every sense "without sin"—his blood so pure and precious that it can avail to the purging away of all iniquity, his flesh the root and nourishment in the saved, of an immortal life; so that the participation of his merits by the exercise of a realizing faith is fellowship with all that is holiest and best; it is the soul's being engrafted into the very purity and blessedness of Heaven. The true believer is made "the righteousness of God in him."

THE BURNT-OFFERING.

The name commonly given in Scripture to this species of sacrifice is *olah* (עולה) *an ascension*, so called, from the whole being consumed and going up in a flame to the Lord. It also received the name *kalil* (כליל) *the whole*, with reference also to the entire consumption, and possibly not without respect to its general and comprehensive character.

For in this respect it was distinguished from all the other sacrifices, and raised above them. The sin and trespass-offerings were presented with the view of making atonement for special sins, and had for their object the restoring of the offerer to a state of peace and fellowship with God, which had been interrupted by the commission of iniquity. But the burnt-offering was for those who were already standing within the bonds of the covenant, and without any such sense of guilt lying upon their conscience, as exposed them to excision from the covenant. We are not, however, to suppose on this account, that there was to be no conscience of sin in the offerer when he presented this sacrifice; for he was required to lay his hands on the head of the victim, (with which confession of sin was always accompanied,) and it was ex-

pressly said "to be accepted for him, to make atonement for him," (Lev. i. 4.) But the guilt for which atonement here required to be made, was not that properly of special and formal acts of transgression, but rather of those shortcomings and imperfections which perpetually cleave to the servant of God and mingle even with his best services. But along with this sense of unworthiness and sin, which enters as an abiding element into the state of his mind, there is invariably coupled, especially in his exercises of devotion, a surrender and consecration of his person and powers to the service of God. While he is conscious of, and laments the deficiencies of the past, he cannot but desire to manifest a spirit of more complete devotedness in the time to come. And it was just to express this complicated state of feeling, to which the whole and every individual of the covenant-people should have been continually exercising themselves, that the service of the burnt-offering was appointed.

Hence this offering, combining in itself to a considerable extent what belonged to the other sacrifices, might be regarded as embodying the general idea of sacrifice, and as in a sense representing the whole sacrificial institute. So it appears in Deut. xxxiii. 10, where the office of the priesthood in the presentation of offerings is described simply with a reference to this species of sacrifice: "They shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt-sacrifice upon thy altar." On the same account, it was the kind of offering which was to be presented morning and evening in behalf of the whole covenant-people, and which, especially, during the night, when the altar was required for no other use, was to be so slowly consumed that it might last till the morning, (Ex. xxix. 38—46; Numb. xxviii. 3; Lev. vi. 9.) So that it was the daily and nightly, the constant and perpetual sacrifice—the symbolical expression of what Israel needed to be ever receiving from Jehovah, as the God of the covenant, and yielding to him again as his covenant-people. Holding such a position in the sacrificial institute, we can also easily understand why the altar of sacrifice should have received its special designation from this, being usually called "the altar of burnt-offering." And in further accordance with the same general view, we find from sacred history what the nature of the institution might have led us to expect, that it was the kind of sacrifice anciently employed for expressing all sorts of devotional feelings, whether of gratitude for past mercies, or in supplicating future blessings, or in deprecating apprehended calamities, (Gen. viii. 20; Job i. 5, xlii. 8; Numb. xxiii.)*

All the special directions regarding the sacrifice agree with the view now exhibited. In conformity with its general and comprehensive character, or its connexion with the abiding and habitual state of the worshipper, much was left to his own discretion, both as to the kind of victim to be presented, and the particular times for presenting it. It might be chosen either from the herd or the

* Outram, de Sac. i. c. x. § 5.

flock—but in each case must be a male without blemish, the best and most perfect of its kind—or he might even go to the genus of fowls, and choose a turtle dove or young pigeon. The blood of the victim was simply poured around the altar, the most general form of the atoning-action; and with the exception of the skin, which was all that could be given to the priests without detracting from the completeness of the offering, the whole carcass, after being cut into suitable pieces, and the filth that might adhere to any of them washed off, was laid upon the altar and burnt. (In the case of the pigeons the crop was first removed, as but imperfectly belonging to the bird, not properly a part of its flesh and blood.) In that consumption of the whole, after the outpouring of the blood for his acceptance, the offerer, if he entered into the spirit of the service, saw expressed his own dedication of himself, soul and body, to the service of God—self-dedication following upon, and growing out of pardon and acceptance with God. And as such consecration of the person to God must again appear, and express itself in the fruits of a holy life, the burnt-offering was always accompanied with a meat and drink-offering, through which the worshipper pledged himself to the diligent performance of the deeds of righteousness, (Numb. xv. 3—11, xxviii. 7—15.)

That Christ was here also the end of the law, and realized to the full what the burnt-offering thus symbolized, will readily be understood. In so far as it contained the blood of atonement, ever in the course of being presented for the covenant-people, it shadowed forth Christ as the one and all for his people, in regard to deliverance from the guilt of sin—the fountain to which they must daily and hourly repair to be washed from their uncleanness. And in so far as it expressed, through the consumption of the victim and the accompaniment of food, the dedication of the offerer to God for all holy working and fruitfulness in well-doing, the symbol met with unspeakably its highest realization in Him, who came to do not his own will, but the will of the Father that sent him; who sought not his own glory, but the glory of his Father; who said, even in the last extremities and in reference to the most appalling trials, "Not my will but thine be done; I have glorified thee on earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do; and now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

But in this the blessed Redeemer did not stand alone; here it could no longer be said, "of the people there was none with him." As bearing the doom and penalty of sin, he is infinitely exalted above the highest and holiest of his brethren; none of them can share with him either in the burden or the glory of the work given him to do; these are exclusively his own, and it is for them simply to receive from his hand, as the debtors of his grace, and enter into the spoils of his dear-bought victory. But in the spirit of self-dedication and holy obedience, which animated him from first to last in his high undertaking, he was the forerunner of his people, and the same must breathe and operate in them. As he yielded

himself to the Father, so they must yield themselves to him, drawn by the constraint of his love and the mercies of his redemption to present themselves in him as living sacrifices, that they may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. And the more always they realize their interest in his blood for the pardon of sin and acceptance with God, the more are they disposed to yield themselves to the Lord for a ready submission to his righteous will, and to say with the Psalmist, "O Lord, truly I am thy servant; I am thy servant, the son of thine handmaid, thou hast loosed my bonds."

THE PEACE-OFFERING.

The general name for this species of offering is *shelamim* (שלמים,) and comes from a root which signifies to make up, to supply what is wanting or deficient, to pay or recompense; and hence it very naturally came to express a state in which all misunderstandings or disturbances having been removed, there was room for friendship, harmony and peace, prosperity. And the sacrifice, which went by this name, might be employed in reference to any occasion on which such ideas became strikingly displayed.

The peace-offerings appear under three divisions—the sacrifice of thanksgiving or praise (תודה) of a vow (נדר) and of free will (נדבה.) The last of these is marked as being somewhat inferior, by the circumstance that an animal with something lacking or superfluous in its parts might be offered (Lev. xxii. 23,) while in both the other sorts the rule, of being without blemish, was strictly enforced (ver. 21.) And again a difference is marked, a measure of inferiority in both of the last two as compared with the first, in that they are treated conjointly, as coming under the same general laws (Lev. vii. 16—21,) while the first has a section for itself (v. 11–15,) and also that the flesh of those two might be eaten, either on the first or the second day, while the flesh of the thank or praise offering must be eaten on the first, or else burnt with fire. These are certainly rather slight distinctions; but they are quite sufficient to indicate degrees of excellence or worth in the respective offerings, in which the sacrifice of praise holds the highest, and that of free-will the lowest place. While also the free-will and the votive peace-offering had much in common, and are made to stand under one general law as to the service connected with them, they are not unfrequently presented as in a kind of contrast to each other (Lev. vii. 16, xxiii. 21, 23, &c.) This, however, merely arose from the different circumstances in which they were usually presented. Persons who received some striking interpositions of Providence at a time when they could not make any suitable outward return—or, more commonly, persons who were involved in danger or distress, and greatly desired the interposition of the divine hand to bring deliverance, were accustomed to vow certain offerings to the Lord in respect to the goodness either actually vouchsafed, or fervently sought. From the moment that the vow was made, they lay under an express obligation to perform

what was specified; their sacrifice as to its obligation ceased to be a voluntary service; and if some time elapsed between the promise and the performace, there was considerable danger of the feeling that dictated the vow suffering abatement, and the worshipper either failing to make good his obligation, or doing so under a constraint. Hence, not only the sort of contrast sometimes indicated between the votive and free-will offerings, but also the pointed allusions to the necessity of fulfilling such vows after they were made, and the care which pious men took to maintain in this respect a good conscience (Ps. xxii. 25, lxvi. 13, lxxvi. 11; Prov. xx. 25; Eccl. v. 4, 5, &c.) When actually presented, such votive offerings must have partaken chiefly of the nature of thanksgivings, as in the mode of their origination they possessed somewhat of the character of a prayer. In ordinary circumstances, however, and when the worshipper was in a condition to give outward and immediate expression to his feelings in an act of worship, it would seem that the free-will peace-offering was the embodied prayer (Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 4; 1 Sam. xiii. 9; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25,) as we find peace-offerings presented in circumstances which naturally called for supplication, and which preclude the thought of any other than free-will offerings. And the relation of the three kinds to each other, with their respective gradations, may be indicated with probable correctness as follows: The thank or praise-offering was the expression of the worshipper's feelings of adoring gratitude on account of having received some spontaneous tokens of the Lord's goodness—this was the highest form, as here the grace of God alone shone forth. The vow-sacrifice was the expression of like feelings for benefits received from the divine beneficence, but which were partly conferred in consideration of a vow made by the worshipper—this was of a lower grade, having something of man connected with it. And the free-will offering which was presented without any constraint of necessity, and either without respect to any special acts of mercy experienced, or with a view to the obtaining of such, occupied a still lower ground, as the worshipper here took the initiative, and appeared in the attitude of one seeking after God.*

In regard to the offerings themselves, they were all to be accompanied with imposition of hands, and the sprinkling of the blood round about the altar, which implied that they had in the first instance to do with sin, and like all the other offerings brought this to remembrance. The occasion of their presentation being some manifestation of God, of his mercy and goodness, whether desired or obtained, it fitly served to remind the worshipper of his unworthiness of the boon, and his unfitness in himself to stand before God in peace, when God might come near. It was this feeling which gave rise to the maxim, that no one could see God's face and live, and which so often found vent for itself in the ancient

* Kurtz, Mosaische Opfer, p. 138–9. The view given above is substantially the same also with that of Scholl, Hengstenberg, Baumgarten, and in its leading features was already given by Outram, i. 11, § 1. Baehr differs on some points, and is far, indeed, from being a safe guide in any of the sacrifices.

worshipper, even when the manifestation actually given of God was of the most gracious kind. This is well brought out by Baehr in reference to the matter now under discussion, however his defective views have led him to misapply the statement, or to overlook the plain inferences deducible from it: "The reference to sin and atonement discovers itself in the most striking and decided manner, precisely in regard to that species of peace-offerings which was the most important and customary, and which might seem at first sight to have least to do with such a reference, viz. in the praise-offering. The word (תודה) comes from a verb, which signifies as well to confess to Jehovah sin, guilt, misconduct, as to ascribe adoration and praise to his name, (comp. Ps. xxxii. 4; 1 Kings viii. 33, also Josh. vii. 19.) The confession of sin can only be made in the light of God's holiness; hence, when man confesses his sin before God, he at the same time confesses the holiness of God; but as holiness is the expression of the highest name of Jehovah, the confession of sin with Israel carries along with it the confession of the name of Jehovah; and every confession of this name, as the front and centre of all divine manifestations, is at the same time glory and praise to God. Accordingly, the Hebrews necessarily thought in their praise offerings of the confession of sin, and with this coupled the idea of an atonement; so that an atoning virtue was properly regarded as essentially belonging to this sacrifice."*

It was common to peace-offerings with sin and trespass-offerings, that the fat and the parts immediately connected therewith, as the richer and better portion of the animal, were burnt on the altar to Jehovah. But it was peculiar to the peace-offerings that besides this, certain parts of the flesh were by a special act of consecration, waving and heaving, set apart for the priests, and given them as their portion. These parts were the breast and the right shoulder. Why such, in particular, were chosen, is nowhere stated, but it probably arose from their being somehow considered the more excellent parts. And in regard to the ceremony of consecration, according to Jewish tradition it was performed by laying the parts on the hands of the offerer, and the priest putting his hand again underneath, then moving them in a horizontal direction for the waving, and in a vertical one for the heaving. It would appear that the ceremony was commonly divided, that one part of it alone was usually performed at a time, and that in regard to the peace-offerings the waving was peculiarly connected with the breast—which is thence called the wave-breast, Lev. vii. 30, 32, 34,—and the heaving with the shoulder, for this reason called the heave-shoulder. There can be little doubt that the rite was intended to be a sort of presentation of the parts to God, as the supreme ruler in all the regions of this lower world and in the higher regions above: the more suitable in connexion with the peace-offerings, as these were acknowledgments of the Lord's power and goodness in

* Symbolik, ii. p. 379-80.

all the departments of providence, and in the blessings which come down from above. When those parts were thus presented and set apart to the priesthood, the Lord's familiars, the rest of the flesh, it was implied, was given up to the offerer to be partaken of by himself and those he might call to share and rejoice with him. Among these he was instructed to invite, besides his own friends, the Levite, the widow, and the fatherless, (Deut. xii. 18, xvi. 11.)

This participation by the offerer and his friends, this family feast upon the sacrifice, may be regarded as the most distinctive characteristic of the peace-offerings. It denoted that the offerer was admitted to a state of near fellowship and enjoyment with God, shared part and part with himself and his priests, had a standing in his house, and a seat at his table. It was, therefore, the symbol of established friendship with God and near communion with him in the blessings of his kingdom; and was associated in the minds of the worshippers with feelings of peculiar joy and gladness;—but these always of a sacred character. The feast and the rejoicing were still to be "before the Lord," in the place where he put his name, and in company with those who were ceremonially pure. And with the view of marking how far all impurity and corruption must be put away from such entertainments, the flesh had to be eaten on the first, or at farthest the second day, after which, being no longer in a fresh state, it became an abomination.

Turning our view to Christian times, we find the ideas symbolized in the peace-offering reappearing, and obtaining their adequate expression, both in Christ himself, and in his people. What it indicated in regard to the presenting of an atonement, could of course find its antitype only in Christ, as all the blood shed in ancient sacrifice pointed to that blood of his, which alone cleanseth from sin. And inasmuch as all the blessings which Christ obtained for his church were received in answer to intercessory prayer, and when received, formed the occasion also on his part of giving praise and glory to the Father, so here also we see the grand realization of the peace-offering in Him, who in the name and the behalf of his redeemed could say, "My praise shall be of thee in the great congregation, I will pay my vows before them that fear him," (Ps. xxii. 25.)

Viewed, however, as a representation of the state and feelings of the worshipper, the service of the peace-offering bears respect, more directly and properly to the people of Christ, than to Christ himself. And so viewed, it exhibits throughout an elevated and faithful pattern of their spiritual condition, and the righteous principles and feelings by which that is pervaded. In the feast upon the sacrifice, the feeding at the Lord's own table, and on the provisions of his house, we see the blessed state of honour and dignity to which the child of God is raised; his nearness to the Father, and freedom of access to the best things in his kingdom; so that he can rejoice in the goodness and mercy which are made to pass before him, and can say, "I have all and abound." But remember, the very place where the feast was held—"before the Lord,"

—and the careful exclusion of all putrid appearances, give solemn warning, that such a high dignity and blessed satisfaction can be held only by the sanctified mind, and the spiritual delight which is reaped can by no means consist with the love and practice of sin. Nay, see in the prayers, the vows, the thanksgivings and praises with which those peace-offerings were accompanied, and of which they were but the outward expression, how much the possessors of this elevated condition should be exercised to the work of communion with Heaven, and especially how sweet should be to them "the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of the lips!" (Heb. xiii. 15.) And then, in the way by which the worshipper attained to a fitness for enjoying the privilege referred to, namely, through the life-blood of atonement, how impressive a testimony was borne to the necessity of seeking the road to all dignity and blessing in the kingdom of God through faith in a crucified Redeemer! By him has the provision been made, and the door opened, and the invitation issued to go in and partake; such only as have been covered upon by his precious blood can be admitted to taste, or be prepared to relish the feast of fat things he sets before them; for through him as the grand medium of reconciliation and acceptance, must their persons be brought nigh, and their devotions be presented, and their souls be prepared for communion and fellowship with God. The unsanctified by the blood of Christ must of necessity be aliens from God's household, and strangers at his table.

THE MEAT-OFFERING.

The proper and distinctive name for what is called the meat-offering, was *mincha* (מנחה,) although the word is sometimes used in a more extended sense, as a general name for offerings or things presented to the Lord. It is not expressly said, that this kind of offering was only to be an addition to the last two species of bloody sacrifices (the burnt-offering and peace-offering,) and that it could never be presented as something separate and independent. But the whole character of the Mosaic institutions, and the analogy of particular parts of them, certainly warrants the inference, that it was not the intention of God, that the meat-offering should ever be presented alone; as there was here no confession of sin and no expiation of guilt. And accordingly, when the children of Israel were enjoined to bring, on two separate occasions, special offerings of this kind—the sheaf of first-fruits, and the two loaves, (Lev. xxiii. 10, 12, 17, 20,) on both occasions alike the offering had to be accompanied with the sacrifice of slain victims. The ordinary employment of the meat-offering was in connexion with the burnt and peace-offerings, which were always to have it as a necessary and proper supplement, (Numb. xv. 1, 13.)

The meat-offering, as to its materials, consisted principally of a certain portion of flour or cakes, with which, it would seem, there was always connected a suitable quantity of wine for a drink-offering. The latter is not mentioned in Lev. ii., which expressly treats

of the meat-offering, but is elsewhere spoken of as a usual accompaniment, (Ex. xxix. 40; Lev. xxiii. 13; Numb. xv. 5, 10, &c.,) and was probably omitted in the second chapter of Leviticus for the same reason, that it was noticed only by implication with the show-bread, viz., that it formed quite a subordinate part of the offering, and was merely a sort of accessory. Being of the same nature with the show-bread, which has already been considered, we need not enter here on any investigation into the design of the offering; but may simply mention in respect to this generally, that it was appended to the burnt and peace-offerings, to show that the object of such offerings was the sanctification of the people by fruitfulness in well-doing, and that without this the end aimed at never could be attained.

This meat-offering was not to be prepared with leaven or honey, but always with salt, oil, and frankincense. Leaven or yeast, is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion; hence, it very naturally became an image of moral corruption. Plutarch assigns as the reason, why the priest of Jupiter was not allowed to touch leaven, that "it comes out of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mingled."* The New Testament usage leaves no room to doubt, that by the leaven was spiritually meant all manner of malice and wickedness, whatever tends to mar the simplicity and corrupts the purity of the people of God—from which, therefore, the symbolical offerings that represented the good works and holy lives of the worshipper, must be kept separate, (Matt. xvi. 6; Luke xii. 1; 1 Cor. v. 6, 8; Gal. v. 9.)—The prohibition of honey is variously understood; and is very commonly regarded as interdicted for the same reason substantially which excluded leaven, as being both in itself, and as an article of diet, when taken in any quantity, liable to become sour and corrupt. So Winer, Baehr, Baumgarten, and many others. But this seems rather far-fetched, and has little to countenance it in the references made to honey in the Old Testament. There it almost uniformly appears as of all things in nature the most sweet and gratifying to the natural taste—the fitting representative, therefore, of whatever is most pleasing to the flesh; hence, as Jarchi says, "All sweet fruit was called honey;" and another Jewish authority, connecting the natural with the spiritual here, testifies that "the reason why honey was forbidden, was because evil concupiscence is sweet to a man as honey," (see Ainsworth on Lev. ii. 11.) As, therefore, the corrupting element of leaven was forbidden, to indicate the contrariety of every thing spiritually corrupt to the pure worship and service of God, so here the most luscious production of nature was also prohibited, to indicate that what is most pleasing to the flesh is not pleasing to God, and must be renounced by his faithful servants.†

* Bib. Cyclop. art. Leaven.

† The prohibition of leaven and honey was only for the usual meat-offering, and did not apply to the first-fruits, as the first-fruits of every thing had to be presented to the Lord; hence the wave-loaves were leavened, Lev. xxiii. 17, and honey is mentioned among the first-fruits presented in 2 Chron. xxxi. 5. These, however,

In regard to the ingredients with which the meat-offering was to be accompanied, there is scarcely any room for diversity of opinion. Salt is the great preservative of animal nature, opposing the tendency to putrefaction and decay. It was, therefore, well fitted to serve as a symbol of that moral and religious purity, which is essential to the true worship of God, and on which all stability and order ultimately depend. Hence, also, it is called "the salt of the covenant of God," being an emblem at once of the perpetuity of this, and of the principles of holy rectitude, the true elements of incorruption, for the maintenance of which it was established. When our Lord said to his disciples: "Ye are the salt of the earth," he wished them to know, that it was their part to exercise throughout society the same sanatary, healthful, purifying, and preservative influence, which salt did in the things of nature. And when again asserting, that every one should have "salt in themselves, and that every sacrifice must be salted with salt," (Mark ix. 49, 50,) he intimates, that the property, which enters into the lives of God's people, and renders them a sort of spiritual salt, must be within, consisting in the possession of a good conscience toward God.—The oil, symbol of the grace of God's Spirit, with which the meat-offering was to be intermingled, implied that every good work, capable of being presented to God, must be all inwrought by the Spirit of God; and that frankincense was to be put upon it, bespoke the connexion between good works and prayer, and that the former should always be presented to God in the spirit of devotion. So that "the good works of the faithful are represented by the oil, as prompted, quickened, and matured by the Holy Spirit—by the frankincense, as made acceptable and borne heavenwards in prayer—and by the salt, as incorruptible, perpetually abiding signs, and fruits of God's covenant of grace."*

CHAPTER VIII.

SPECIAL RITES AND INSTITUTIONS CHIEFLY CONNECTED WITH SACRIFCE —THE RATIFICATION OF THE COVENANT—THE RED HEIFER—THE LEPROSY AND ITS TREATMENT—THE NAZARITE AND HIS OFFERINGS—DISTINCTIONS OF CLEAN AND UNCLEAN FOOD.

THE subjects, on which we mean to offer a few remarks in this chapter, were of a somewhat peculiar nature, and though several of them might have been introduced in connexion with certain parts of the preceding discussions, we yet deemed it better to give

did not come upon the altar, but were only presented to the Lord, and given to the priests.

* Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 102. Compare also what was said above on the show-bread, p. 252, 256.

them a separate place. The remarks to be submitted respecting them will be chiefly of an explanatory character, as nearly all the principles, of which they were intended to give an embodied representation, have already passed under our consideration.

THE RATIFICATION OF THE COVENANT.

The account given of this solemn transaction is brought into view in the epistle to the Hebrews, (ch. ix. 18, 22,) with an especial respect to the use then made of the sacrificial blood, and for the purpose of proving, that as the inferior and temporary covenant then ratified, required the shedding of animal blood, blood of a far higher and more precious kind must have been required to seal the everlasting covenant brought in by Christ. The whole ceremony consisted in Moses having on the previous day read the law of the ten commandments, "the words of the Lord," in the audience of the people, with the few precepts and judgments that had been privately communicated to him after their promulgation; then, on the following morning he caused an altar to be built under the hill, and twelve stones erected beside it, to represent the twelve tribes of the congregation; certain young men, appointed priests for the occasion, were next sent to kill oxen for burnt-offerings and peace offerings, and the blood of these slain victims being received into basins, Moses divided it into two parts—the one of which he sprinkled on the altar, thereby making atonement for their sins, and so rendering them ceremonially fit for being taken into a covenant of peace with God; and with the other half—after having again read the terms of the covenant, and obtained anew from the people a promise of obedience,—he sprinkled the people themselves and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." It is added in the epistle to the Hebrews, that the book of the covenant was also sprinkled; which, we presume, must have been done with the first half of the blood, and with somewhat of the same meaning and design with which the mercy-seat that was afterwards placed over the tables of the covenant, was annually sprinkled in the Most Holy Place.

The grand peculiarity in this service was manifestly the division of the blood between Jehovah and the people, and the sprinkling of the latter with the portion appropriated to them. We found something similar in the consecration of Aaron, whose extremities were touched with the blood of the ram of consecration. But the action here was still considerably different, and was directed to the special purpose of giving a palpable exhibition of the oneness that now subsisted between the two parties of the covenant. Naturally they stood quite apart from each other; sin had formed an awful gulf between them; but God having first accepted in their behalf the life-blood of the innocent, they were brought into a capacity of union and fellowship with him; and then, when they had solemnly declared their adherence to the terms on which this was

to be established, and which simply contained a revelation of God's purposes of righteousness in regard to them, the agreement was formally cemented by the sprinkling of the other part of the life-blood upon them. For thus they shared part and part with God; the pure and innocent life he provided and accepted in their behalf, became (symbolically) theirs; a vital and hallowed bond united the two into one; God's life was their life, God's table their table; and in farther proof of this identity of feeling and interest, they doubtless partook of the meat of the peace-offerings, which formed the second kind of sacrifices presented.

The usual and necessary imperfections of course marred the completeness of this service; and in Christ alone and his kingdom is a reality to be found, such as the necessities of the case and the demands of God's righteousness properly required. Here, too, the parties are naturally far asunder, the members of the covenant being all by nature the children of wrath, even as others; and that the covenant of reconciliation and peace might be established on a solid, satisfactory, and permanent basis, while there must be the shedding of blood, that blood must be such as both parties are alike interested in—such as might at once be called God's "own blood," (Acts xx. 28,) and the blood of his church, flowing from the heart of one, who was equally the seed of God and the seed of the woman. Such in the strictest sense was the blood of Jesus; and in it, therefore, we discern the real, the only real bond of peace, and sure foundation of an everlasting covenant between man and God. He, whose conscience is sprinkled with this, is thereby made partaker of a divine nature; he is received into the participation of the life of God, and is consecrated for evermore to live in the divine communion, and in obedience to the divine will. As the Father is in Christ, so Christ is in him, and he in Christ; and nothing in privilege is wanting to admit of his standing in nearest connexion with the Godhead, or to enable him to yield such fruit of righteousness, as becomes a member of the kingdom.

But a question may here, perhaps, suggest itself in respect to the covenant itself, which was ratified between God and Israel in the manner we have noticed. For if the terms of that covenant were, as we formerly endeavoured to show, specially and peculiarly the law of the ten commandments, and if the law is equally binding on the church now as a permanent rule of duty, how should it have been taken as the distinctive covenant or bond of agreement with Israel? Was not this after all to place Israel simply on a footing with men universally? And does it not appear something like an incongruity, to ratify such a covenant by such symbolical and shadowy services? There would, undoubtedly, be room for such questions, if this covenant were entirely isolated from what went before, or came after—if not taken in connexion with the relation out of which properly it grew, and with the ordinances and institutions by which it was necessarily followed up. On the one hand, the covenant was prescribed by God as having redeemed his people

from a state of bondage, and conferred on them a title to an inheritance of blessing, thereby pledging himself to give whatever was essentially needed, to have a substantial conformity maintained to its requirements of duty. But while these requirements of necessity pointed to the great lines of religious and moral duty binding on the church in every age—for God's own character of holiness being perpetually the same, he could not then take his people bound to live according to other principles of duty than are always obligatory—while, therefore, they necessarily possessed that broad and general character, still, in the peculiar circumstances in which Israel stood, many things, on the other hand, necessarily came along with what properly constituted the terms of the covenant, and which were of a merely national, shadowy, and temporary kind. The redemption they had obtained was itself but a shadow of a greater one to come, and so also was the inheritance to which they were appointed. No adequate provision was yet made for the higher wants of their nature; and though, even in that lower territory, on which God was avowedly acting for them and openly revealing himself to them, he could not but exact from them a faithful endeavour after conformity to his law of holiness, as the condition of their abiding fellowship with him, yet the ostensible provision for securing this was also manifestly inadequate, and could only be regarded as temporary. So that the covenant on every hand stood related to the symbolical and typical, though itself neither the one nor the other. As it grew out of relations having a typical bearing, so it of necessity brought with it ordinances and institutions which had a similar bearing; "it had (appended to it, or bound up with it) ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary," (Heb. ix. 1.) Some leading portions of these were consequently introduced into the book of the covenant, to show the necessity, for the time then present, of their existence, and of course, at the same time, implying that the covenant of law which bound Israel to all dutiful obedience to God, required a faithful observance of them, so long as the shadowy dispensation stood to which they belonged. The distinctive difference, however, between the New covenant and the Old, lies mainly in the uniform character of the things belonging to the former, as all directly relating to men's higher interests, and having respect to the ultimate ends of God's government; there is here as much of reality in the redemption provided and the inheritance secured, as in the principles of love enjoined in the eternal law of rectitude. It is, therefore, "a better covenant," because "established upon better promises," and having connected with it means and provisions of grace, which are far more effectual for carrying out the spiritual ends for which it is established. But still the radical matter and ultimate object of both covenants was substantially the same, being alike designed to secure and perpetuate the union of fallen men with God—a God, who, as to his essential character, is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

THE RED HEIFER.

The ordinance regarding the Red Heifer (described in Numb. xix.,) had respect to a special kind of defilements, and to the means of purification from them. The defilements in question were such as arose from personal contact with the dead, such as the touching of a dead body, or dwelling in a tent where death had entered, or lighting on the bone of a dead man, or having to do with a grave in which a corpse had been deposited. In such cases a bodily uncleanness was contracted, which lasted seven days, and even then could not be removed but by a very peculiar element of cleansing, viz., the application of the ashes, mixed with water, of the body of a heifer, red-coloured, without blemish, unaccustomed to the yoke, burnt without the camp, and with cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet, cast into the midst of the burning.

In regard, first, to the occasion of this very peculiar service, it will readily be understood, that, in accordance with the general nature of the symbolical institutions, the body stands as the representative and image of the soul, and its defilement and cleansing, for actual guilt and spiritual purification. This, indeed, was clearly indicated in the ordinance being called "a purification for sin," (ver. 9.) But it is the soul, not the body, which is properly chargeable with sin; and the whole, therefore, of what is here described, was evidently intended to serve merely as the shell and outward representation of inward and spiritual realities. Divine truths and lessons were embodied in it for all times and ages. For what, according to the uniform language of scripture, is death? It is the direful wages of sin—the visible, earthly recompense, with which God visits transgression; and being in itself the greatest of all natural evils, the state from which flesh naturally and most of all shrinks with instinctive abhorrence, it is the sad witness of the universal prevalence, and the grand proof of the odiousness of sin. This may be said of death only in the aspect it carries to men's natural state and feelings; and much more may the same be affirmed of it when viewed in connexion with the Most High. It stands in utter contrariety to his blessed and glorious nature. He is the Living One, sole fountain of life, and so essentially connected with that, in which life properly consists, that no corruption can dwell in his presence. But death is the very essence of corruption; and being in consequence most abhorrent to his nature, it has been made to stand as the chief monument of his displeasure against sin, and to be a perpetual witness of sin's exceeding sinfulness.

This is the painful truth which lies at the foundation of the whole of this rite about the Red Heifer. It is a rite which presents in bold relief what was one grand design of the law's observances, the bringing of sin to remembrance, and teaching the necessity of men's being purified from its pollution. It is true there was no actual sin in simply touching a dead body, or being in the place where such a body lay. But as the corporeal relations were here made the signs and interpreters of the spiritual, there was, in such

cases, the coming, on the part of the living body, into contact with what bore on it the awful mark and impress of sin—a breathing of the polluted atmosphere of corruption, most alien to the region, full of incorruptible and blessed life, where Jehovah has his peculiar dwelling. Therefore, in a symbolical religion like the Mosaic, the neighbourhood or touch of a dead body was most fitly regarded as forming an interruption to the intercourse between God and his people—as placing them in a condition of external unfitness for approaching the sanctuary of his presence and glory, or even for having freedom to go out and in among the living in Jerusalem. That sin, which is the bitter well-spring of death, is utterly at variance with the soul's peace and fellowship with God—that it should, therefore, be most carefully watched against and shunned —that on finding his conscience defiled with its pollution, the sinner should regard himself as incapacitated for holding intercourse with Heaven, or performing any work of righteousness, and should betake himself without delay to the appointed means of purification,—these are the important and salutary truths which the Lord sought continually to impress upon the people by means of the bodily defilements in question, and the channel provided for obtaining purification.

In regard now to the purifying apparatus, there are certainly some points connected with it, which it is scarcely possible to explain quite satisfactorily, and which probably refer to customs or notions too familiar and prevalent in the age of Moses to have then appeared at all strange or arbitrary. But the leading features of the ordinance would present, we conceive, little difficulty, were it not that the whole has been viewed in a somewhat mistaken light. Recent, as well as former, writers have generally gone on the supposition that the ideas concerning sin, and atonement or cleansing, are here represented in a peculiarly intense form, and that from this point of view every thing must be explained. We regard the occasion as pointing rather in the opposite direction. It was not an ordinance strictly speaking for sin, but for a sort of incidental, corporeal connexion with the effect and fruit of sin—the means of purification not from actual guilt, but from a merely external contact with the bodily consequence of guilt—a symbolical ordinance of cleansing for what, in itself, was only a symbolical defilement. Directly, therefore, and properly it is the flesh, and not the spirit that is concerned; and we might certainly expect a marked inferiority in various respects between this ordinance, and such ordinances as were for deliverance from actual transgression. This is precisely what we find. The victim appointed was a female, while in all the proper sin-offerings for the congregation, a male, an ox, was required. And of this victim, no part came upon the altar; even the blood was only sprinkled before the tabernacle of the congregation, and that not by the High-priest, but only by the son of the High-priest; and while the carcass was burnt entire without the camp, not even the skin or the dung was removed from it. From the respect the offering had to bodily defilements, the priest

and the other persons engaged in the work, contracted a similar defilement, and had to wash their clothes and bathe themselves in water. That the ashes were regarded as in themselves clean, is obvious from a clean person being required to gather them up and put them in a clean place; as also from their being the appointed means of purification. For this, it was necessary, that living or running water should be poured upon them; and then during the seven days that the defilement from contact with the dead lasted, the persons or articles requiring it were twice sprinkled, first on the third, then on the seventh day; after which the restraint was taken off, as to fellowship with the camp. The mixture of the ashes strengthened the cleansing property of the water, not, however (as Baehr thinks,) by rendering it a sort of wash,—if that had been all, common ashes might have served the purpose—but rather from their connexion with the sin-offering through which the curse of death was taken away. And the bearing of the whole on Christian times with respect to the higher work of Christ, is so plainly and distinctly indicated in the epistle to the Hebrews, that there is no need for any further comment: "If the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God!" Whoever looks with this view to the ordinance, will see in it the perfect purity and completeness of Christ's character, the corrupt and loathsome nature of that for which he died, the efficacy, and alone efficacy of his blood, so that he who has not this applied to his conscience must inevitably perish.

[We have taken little or no notice of some of the peculiarities connected with this ordinance, which have given rise to much discussion, but have, as yet, ended in no satisfactory result. The female sex of the victim (sufficiently accounted for we trust above,) has been thought by Baehr to point to Eve, or the female sex generally, as the mother of life among men, and others have produced equally fanciful reasons; the colour was by the Jewish doctors accounted of such difficult interpretation, that they conceived the wisdom of Solomon to have been inadequate to the discovery of it. With Baehr it is the colour of blood, life; with Hengstenberg of sin, &c. And the latter recently, as well as many others in former times, have found an allusion in it to the Egyptian notion, that the evil god Typhon was of red colour, and the practice prevalent in Egypt of sacrificing red bullocks to him. Only that the rite here might savour somewhat less of heathenism, not a bullock, but a heifer, was required, to discountenance the idolatrous veneration paid in Egypt to the cow. We deem it quite unnecessary to enter upon any exposure of such fanciful and groundless notions. It was more likely, we conceive, that the colour should bear a respect to the body or flesh of man, for which immediately the offering was presented. Man's body having been taken from the ground, he was called *Adam* (אדם,) and it is the same word, only differently

pointed, so as to make it sound *edom*, which signified red—probably because the kind of redness denoted was a sort of ground or earth-colour. Without searching for any more recondite reasons, one can easily perceive a propriety in the victim in question being of such a colour, as it had peculiarly to represent and stand for the bodies of the people. However, no particular stress should be laid, nor is there in Scripture any laid, upon the circumstance. The burning along with the victim of cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool, has also given rise to a great variety of suppositions. The cedar from its loftiness, and the hyssop from its smallness, have been regarded by Hengstenberg (Egypt and Books of Moses, and again in Commen. on Ps. li. 7,) as emblems, the one of the divine majesty, and the other of the divine condescension. But the supposition is quite arbitrary, and has nothing properly to support it in Scripture. Besides, it could scarcely be the lofty cedar, which was meant to be used in the ordinance, for such were not to be found in the desert; it must rather have been some species of juniper. (See Bib. Cyclop. art. Eres.) The hyssop, it would appear, was anciently thought to possess some sort of medicinal or abstergent properties, and on that account probably was so much used in purifications. It appears to have been generally used among the Hebrews in sprinkling, along with some portion of scarlet wool. (Comp. Ex. xii. 22; Lev. xiv. 6, 7; Ps. li. 7; Heb. ix. 19.) It is quite possible that notions and customs regarding these articles, of which now no certain information is to be had, may have led to their use on such occasions as the present. It would seem, however, from what is said in the case of the leper (Lev. xiv. 6, 7,) that their use was merely to apply the cleansing or purifying element —the scarlet and hyssop being probably attached to a stick of cedar. On this account a portion of each was here burnt along with the carcass of the heifer, as the whole together were to furnish the means of purification. But it is needless to pursue the matter farther, as certainty is unattainable, and very little really depends on it for a general understanding of the purport and design of the ordinance.

THE LEPROSY AND ITS PURIFICATION.

The case of the leper, with its appointed means of purification, stood in a very close relation to the one just considered, and the lessons taught in each are to a considerable extent the same. The disease itself of leprosy is described with much minuteness by Moses, (Lev. xiii. xiv.,) and various marks are given to distinguish it from others, which, though somewhat resembling it, still did not possess its inveterate and virulent character. It began in the formation of certain spots upon the skin, small at first, but gradually increasing in dimensions; at their first appearance of a reddish colour, but by and by presenting a white, scaly, shining aspect, attended by little pain, but incapable of being healed by any known remedy. Slowly, yet regularly, the spots continued to increase,

till the whole body came to be overspread with them, and assumed the appearance of a white, dry, diseased, unwholesome scurf. But the corruption extended inwardly while it spread outwardly, and affected even the bones and marrow; the joints became first relaxed, then dislocated; fingers, toes, and even limbs dropt off; and the body at length fell to pieces, a loathsome mass of dissolution and decay. Such is the description of the disease given in Scripture, taken in connexion with what is known of certain bodily disorders which still go by the name of leprosy. It was disease manifesting itself peculiarly in the form of corruption—a sort of living death.

Persons on whom any apparent symptoms were found of this disease, were ordered to go to the priests for inspection; and if it was ascertained to be real leprosy, then the diseased was removed into a separate apartment, and shut out of the camp, while the people were in the wilderness, out of the city after they were settled in Canaan. So rigidly was this regulation enforced, that even Miriam, the sister of Moses, could find no exemption from it; nor at a later period could king Azariah, since we are told, that from the time he was smitten with leprosy to the day of his death, "he dwelt in a several house," (2 Kings xv. 5,) literally a house of emancipation, as one discharged from the ordinary service and occupations of the Lord's people. Even in the kingdom of Samaria, where the divine laws were by no means so strictly observed, the history presents to our view lepers dwelling in a separate house before the gate, which they were still obliged to keep during the straitness of a siege. (2 Kings vii. 13.) And that there was a place or hill set apart for such in Jerusalem, and called by their name, we gather from Jer. xxxi. 38, where reference is made to the hill of Gareb, which means, the hill of the leprous.

Besides this careful separation of the leper, he was to carry about with him every mark of sorrow and distress, going with rent clothes, with bare and uncovered head, with a bandage on the chin or lip, and when he saw any one approaching, that suitable warning might be given of his condition, he was to cry out, "Unclean, unclean!" Why, we naturally ask, all this in the case only of leprosy? It could not be simply because it was a severe and dangerous disease, for no other disease was thus dealt with, nor seemed to have inferred any degree of uncleanness, excepting the disorders connected with generation and birth—formerly referred to. Neither could such singular precautions and painful treatment have been employed here on account of the infectious character of the disease, as if the great object were to prevent it spreading around. For, had that been all, several of the things prescribed would have been needless aggravations of the distress, such as the rent clothes, bare head, and covered chin: and besides, the diseases which are known under the name of leprosy, and which are understood to possess the same general character, though hereditary, are scarcely if at all infectious; while the really infectious diseases have no place whatever in the law, either as regards uncleanness or purification.

The only adequate reason that can be assigned for the manner in which leprosy was thus viewed and treated, was its peculiar connexion with sin, having been made under the divine administration toward Israel, next to death, the chief outward type of sin—the visible sign and expression upon the living, of God's mind regarding the odious nature of sin, and its deserved condemnation. Hence when God showed his working upon particular persons by terrible things in righteousness, and testified his displeasure against their sins by the infliction of a bodily disease, it was in the visitation of leprosy that the judgment commonly took effect, as in the case of Miriam, of Uzziah, of Gehazi. Hence, also, Moses warned the people against incurring such a plague, (Deut. xxiv. 9;) and when David besought the infliction of God's judgment upon the house of Joab, leprosy was one of the forms in which he expressed his desire that this should appear, (2 Sam. iii. 29.) So general was the feeling in this respect, that the leprous were proverbially called *the smitten*, that is, the smitten of God, and from the Messiah being described in Isaiah as so smitten, certain Jewish interpreters inferred, that he would be afflicted with leprosy. (Hengst., Christol. on Isaiah liii. 4.) Now, viewing the disease thus, as a kind of visible copy or image of sin, wrought in judgment by the immediate hand of God on the living body of the sinner, it is not difficult to understand how the leper especially should have been regarded as an object of defilement, theoretically dead, until he was recovered and purified. He bore upon him the impress and mark of iniquity, the begun and spreading corruption of death, the appalling seal of Heaven's condemnation. He was a sort of death in life, a walking sepulchre (Spencer, "sepulchrum ambulans,") unfit while in such a state to draw near to the local habitation of God, or to have a place among the living in Jerusalem. And his exiled and separate condition, his disfigured dress, and lamentable appearance, while they proclaimed the sadness of his case, bore striking testimony at the same time to the holiness of God, and solemnly warned all who saw him to beware how they should offend against it. But these things are written also for our learning, and the malady with its attendant evils, though no longer visible to the bodily eye, speaks still to the ear of faith. It tells us of the insidious and growing nature of sin, spreading, if not arrested by the merciful interposition of God, from small beginnings to a universal corruption—of the inevitable exclusion which it brings when indulged in, from the fellowship of God, and the society of the blessed—of the deplorable and unhappy condition of those who are still subject to its sway—and of the competency of divine grace alone to bring deliverance from the evil.

The purification of the leper had three distinctly marked stages. The first of these bore respect to his reception into the visible community of Israel, the next to his participation in their sacred character, and the last to his full re-establishment in the favour and fellowship of God. When God was pleased to recover him from the leprosy, and the priest pronounced him whole, before he was

permitted to leave his isolated position outside the camp or city, two living clean birds were to be taken for him; the one of which was then to be killed over a vessel of living or fresh water, so that the blood might intermingle with the water, and the other, after being dipt in this blood-water, was let loose into the open field. That the two birds represented the leper in his two different states, is clear as day. The death of the one imaged the doom that lay upon him on account of his impurity, and which was only prevented from taking full effect upon him by the special intervention of divine goodness. The dipping of the other bird in the blood of the former one mingled with water, represented the now restored leper as entering in spirit into the death due to him, and being received again to life; and as partaker of this resurrection-life, he saw in the bird's dismissal, to fly wherever it pleased among the other fowls of heaven, his own liberty to enter into the society of living men, and move freely up and down among them. But in token of his actual participation in the whole, he must first have his body sprinkled with the water and the blood, wash his clothes and his flesh also, even shave his hair, that every remnant of his impurity might appear to be removed, and nothing be left to mar the freedom of his intercourse with his fellow-men.

In all this, however, there was no proper atonement, and though the ban was so far removed that the leper was now regarded as a living man, and could enter into the society of other living men, he was, by no means, admitted to the privileges of a member of God's covenant. He had to remain for an entire week out of his own dwelling. Then for his reception into the full standing of an Israelite, he had to bring a lamb for a trespass-offering, another for a sin-offering, and another still for a burnt-offering, with the usual meat-offering, and a log of oil. The lamb for the trespass-offering and the log of oil were for his consecration—the second stage of the process; and for this purpose they were first waved before the Lord. Then with a portion of the blood of the trespass-offering, the priest sprinkled his right ear, the thumb of his right hand, the great toe of his right foot, repeating the same action afterwards with the oil, and pouring also some upon his head. This action with the blood and oil was much the same with that observed in the consecration of the priesthood; but differed, in that the blood used on this occasion was that of a trespass-offering, whereas the blood used on the other was that of a peace-offering. The service still further differed, in that here the consecration came first, whereas in the case of Aaron the sin and burnt-offering preceded it. The differences, however, are such as naturally arose out of the peculiar situation of the restored leper. As a man under the ban of God and the doom of death, he had lost his place in the kingdom of priests—the Lord's consecrated family. By a special act of consecration he must be received again into the number of this family, before he can be admitted to take any part in the usual services of the congregation. And the blood by which this was chiefly done was most appropriately taken from

the blood of a trespass or guilt-offering, because having forfeited his life to God, there was here, according to the general nature of such offering, the payment of the required ransom, the (symbolical) discharge of the debt; so that he was at one and the same time installed as the Lord's freeman, and consecrated for his service. The consecration of Aaron, on the other hand, was that of one who already belonged to the kingdom of priests, and only required a special sanctification for the peculiar and distinguished office to which he was to be raised. It, therefore, came last, and the blood used was fitly taken of the peace-offering. But when the recovered leper had been thus far restored,—his feet standing within the sacred community of God's people, his head and members anointed with the holy oil of divine refreshment and gladness, he was now permitted and required to consummate the process by bringing a sin-offering, a burnt-offering, and a meat-offering, that his access to God's sanctuary, and his fellowship with God himself, might be properly established. What could more impressively bespeak the arduous and solemn nature of the work, by which the outcast, polluted, and doomed sinner regains an interest in the kingdom and blessing of God! The blood and Spirit of Christ, appropriated by a sincere repentance and a living faith, this, but this alone, can accomplish the restoration. Till that is done, there is only exclusion from the family of God, and alienation from the life that is in him. But that truly done, the child of death lives again; he that was lost is again found.*

THE NAZARITE AND HIS OFFERINGS.

The institution of the Nazarite vow is introduced without any explanation (Numb. vi.,) either as to the manner or the reason of its original appointment; and some have hence inferred that its origin is to be sought in Egypt, and only its proper regulation to be ascribed to Moses. But nothing resembling it can be produced from that quarter. The case of the person under such a vow presented in its leading features a contrast to that of the leper. The latter, while under the visitation of leprosy, was a living type or image of sin; the man under the vow of a Nazarite was a living type or image of holiness. While the one bore the mark of alienation and banishment from the Lord, the other was in a state of peculiar nearness, being given up and consecrated to the Lord. And the whole in this case, as well as in the other, was entirely symbolical. It was no mere ascetical institution, as if the outward

* We have said nothing of what is called the leprosy of clothes and houses, for nothing certain is known of the thing itself—although Michaelis speaks dogmatically enough about both. The whole of what he says upon the leprosy is a good specimen of the thoroughly earthly sense of the author, and if Moses had looked no higher than he represents him to have done, he would certainly have been little entitled to be regarded as a messenger of Heaven. The leprosy in garments and houses was evidently considered and treated as an image of that in man; and on that account alone was purification or destruction ordered. See Hengstenberg's Christol. on Jer. xxxi. 38; Baumgarten on Lev. xii., xiii.

bonds and restraints, the self-denials in meat and drink, were in themselves well-pleasing to the Lord. Such a spirit was as foreign to Judaism as it is to Christianity. The Nazarite was a visible symbolical lesson in a religious and moral respect; and the outward observances to which he was bound, were merely intended to exhibit to the eye the perpetual distinctions between holiness and sin.

The import of the name, Nazarite, is simply *the separate one*, and the vow he took—in all ordinary cases, voluntarily took—upon him, is said to have been (v. 2,) "for separating to the Lord." What was implied in this separation? There must have been, unquestionably, a withdrawing from one class of things as unbefitting, that there might be the more free and devoted application to another class, as proper and becoming. And we shall best understand what both were by glancing at the requirements of the vow.

The first was an entire abstinence from all strong drink; from whatever was made of grapes—from grapes themselves, whether moist or dried, from every thing belonging to the vine. There can be no doubt that it was the intoxicating property of the fruit of the vine, which formed the ground of this prohibition; for special stress is laid upon the strength of the drink; and as the vine in Eastern countries was the chief source of such drink (although other ingredients, it would seem, were sometimes added to increase the strength) not only wine itself, but the fruit of the vine in every shape, even in forms without any intoxicating tendency, was interdicted—that the separation might be the more marked and complete. The same abstinence substantially was imposed upon the priests when engaged in sacred ministrations (Lev. x. 8.) Like the ministering priest, the Nazarite was peculiarly separated to the Lord, and in his drink, as well as other respects, was to be an embodied lesson, regarding the manner in which the divine service was to be performed. This service—such was the import of this part of the Nazarite institution—requires a withdrawal and separation from whatever unfits for active spiritual employment—from every thing which stupifies and benumbs the powers of a divine life, and disposes the heart for carnal pleasure and excitement, rather than for sacred duty. There must, indeed, be a careful and becoming reserve in regard to the means and occasions of a literal intoxication; but not in respect to these alone. The more inward and engrossing love of money—the eager pursuit after worldly aggrandizement—or the delights of a soft and luxurious ease, may as thoroughly intoxicate the brain, and incapacitate the soul for spiritual employment as the more grovelling vice of indulgence to excess in liquor. From all such, therefore, the true servant of God is here warned to abstain, and admonished to keep his vessel, in soul and body, as holiness to the Lord.

The next thing exacted of the Nazarite was to leave his hair unshorn. And this was so different from the prevailing custom, yet so strictly enjoined upon him, that it might be regarded as the peculiar badge of his condition. Hence, if by accidentally com-

ing into contact with any unclean object, his vow was broken, he had to shave his head and enter anew on his course of service. So also, when the period of the vow was expired, his hair was cropt and burned as a sacred thing upon the altar. Thus he was said to bear "the consecration (literally the separation, the distinctive mark, the crown) of his God upon his head." The words readily suggest to us those of the apostle Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 10, and the appointment itself is best illustrated by a reference to the idea there expressed. Speaking of the propriety of the woman wearing long hair, as given to her by nature for a modest covering, and a token of subjection to her husband, the apostle adds, that "for this reason she must have power upon her head;" that is, (taking the sign for the thing signified, as circumcision for the covenant, Gen. xvii. 10,) she must wear long hair, covering her head, as a symbol of the power under which she stands, as being under the higher authority of the man. For the same reason, because the hair did not cover the face, a vail was added, to complete the sign of subjection. But the man, on the other hand, having no earthly superior, and being in his manly freedom and dignity the image of the glory of God, should have his face unveiled, and his hair cropt; hence, it was counted even a shame, a renouncing of the proper standing of a man, a mark of effeminate weakness and degeneracy for men, like Absalom, to cultivate long tresses. But the Nazarite, who gave himself up by a solemn vow of consecration to God, and who should therefore ever feel the authority and the power of his God upon him, most fitly wore his hair long, as the badge of his entire and willing subjection to the law of his God. By the wearing of this badge he taught the church then, and the church, indeed, of all times, that the natural power and authority of man, which in nature is so apt to run out into self-will, stubbornness, and pride, must in grace yield itself up to the direction and supremacy of Jehovah. The true child of God has renounced all claim to the control and mastery of his own condition. He feels he is not his own, but bought with a price, and, therefore, bound to glorify God with his body and spirit, which are his.*

The only other restriction laid upon the Nazarite, of a special kind, was in regard to contracting defilement from the dead; for, like the priest, he was discharged from entering into the chamber

* We deem this by much the most natural and appropriate view of the Nazarite's long hair. It is not a new one, but may be found (there, indeed, only as one among many other reasons,) in Ainsworth, and various others of later date, last and best in Baumgarten, Comm. on Numb. vi. It also renders the best explanation of the loss of power in Samson, flowing from his allowing his hair to be shorn—for this, viewed in the light presented above, betokened the breaking of his allegiance to his God, ceasing to make God's arm his dependence, and God's will his rule.—The idea of Hengstenberg, Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 190, that the long hair was a sign of the Nazarite's withdrawing from the world to give himself to the Lord, separating from the world's habits and business, is not sufficiently grounded; more especially, as it does not appear that the Nazarite vow bound men actually to cease from worldly employments. The idea of Baehr, that the hair of men corresponds to the grass of the earth, the blossoms and leaves of trees, and thus imaged the spiritual blossoms and productions of men, the fruits of holiness—is too fanciful and far-fetched to commend itself to any one.

of death and mourning for his nearest relatives. Separated for God, in whose presence death and corruption can have no place, the Nazarite must ever be found occupying the region of pure and blessed life; and must have no fellowship with what bore so visibly upon it the curse and wages of sin. But this sin itself is, in the sphere of the spiritual life, what death is in the natural. It is the corruption and death of the soul. And as the Nazarite was here also an embodied lesson regarding things spiritual and divine, he was a living epistle, that might be known and read of all men, warning them to resist temptation, and flee from sin—teaching them that, if they would live to God, they must walk circumspectly, and strive to keep themselves unspotted from the world.

Such persons in Israel must have been eminently useful, if raised up in sufficient number, and going with fidelity and zeal through the fulfilment of their vow, in keeping alive upon men's consciences the nature of God's service, and stirring them up to attend to it. The Nazarites are hence mentioned by Amos along with prophets, as among the chosen instruments whom God provided for the good of his people, in proof of his covenant-faithfulness and love: "And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites," (ii. 11.) They were a kind of inferior priesthood in the land—by their manner of life, as the priests, by the duties of their office, acting the part of symbolical lights and teachers to Israel. And the institution was farther honoured by being connected with three of the most eminent servants of God—Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist—on whom the vow was imposed from their very birth, to show that they were destined to some special and important work of God. This destination, to a high and peculiar service, in connexion with the Nazarite vow, still more clearly indicated its symbolical character; the more so, as the end of the institution appears to be always the more fully realized, the higher the individual's calling, and the more entirely he consecrated himself to its fulfilment. Of the three Nazarites referred to, Samson was unquestionably the least, because in him the spiritual separation and surrender to the Lord was most imperfect; he did not resist the temptation to which his singular gift of corporeal strength exposed him, of trusting too much to self; and the gift, when exercised, led him to act chiefly on the lower and merely physical territory. Though in one respect a remarkable witness of the wonderful things which God could do even on that territory by a single instrument of working, he yet proved in another, a sad monument of the inefficacy of such instruments to regenerate and save Israel. A far higher manifestation of divine power and goodness developed itself in Samuel, by whom, more than all the other judges, the cause of God was revived; and a higher again in John the Baptist. But highest and greatest of all in Jesus of Nazareth, in whom the idea of the Nazarite rises to its grand and consummate realization—although in this, as in other things, the outward symbol was dropt, as no longer needed—for in him alone has one been found, who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate

from sinners," light of light, perfect even as the Father is perfect, and without the least flaw of sin or failing of weakness, executing immeasurably the mightiest undertaking that ever was committed to the charge of a messenger of Heaven.

The offerings prescribed for the Nazarite refer to two points in his history—to his contracting defilement, so that the vow was broken, and to the period of its fulfilment. In the first case he had to bring a lamb for a trespass-offering, having, like the leper, contracted a debt in the reckoning of God, by which he became liable to judgment, and so requiring to be discharged from this bond, before any thing could be accepted at his hands. One pigeon, or turtle-dove for a sin-offering, and another for a burnt-offering, had also to be brought, that he might enter anew on his vow, as from the starting-point of full peace and fellowship with God; and the time past being all lost, his hair had to be cut or shaved, to mark the entirely new commencement.—Then, when his period of consecration was finished, he had to bring a whole round of offerings—a sin-offering, in token that, however carefully he might have kept himself for the Lord, sin had still mingled itself with his service, and that he was far from having any thing to boast of before him—a burnt-offering, to indicate his desire that not only the sins of the past might be blotted out, but that the imperfection of his obedience to the will of God might be supplemented by a more full, an entire surrender—lastly, a peace-offering, with various kinds of bread and drink-offerings (including wine, of which he also now partook,) to manifest, that he ceased from his peculiar state of consecration, and entered upon the more ordinary path of dutiful obedience, in settled friendship and near communion with God.

DISTINCTIONS OF CLEAN AND UNCLEAN IN FOOD.

The distinctions made in the Mosaic law regarding food, are quite analogous in their nature to some of the prescriptions already noticed under the preceding heads, and stand also in several respects very closely related to the sacrificial institutions. From this latter respect, certain portions of all animals were forbidden to be used as food—the blood, the fat that covered the inwards, probably also these inwards themselves, and the tail of the sheep, which, in the Syrian sheep is a mass of fat. These were the parts which were set apart in sacrifice for the altar of the Lord, and were hence regarded as too sacred for common use (Lev. iii. 17, xvii. 11.) Why such parts in particular were devoted to the altar, has already been discoursed of.—With the exception of the parts just mentioned, the bodies of all creatures that could be used in sacrifice, were considered as clean and given for food. More, indeed, than these; for the permission extended to all animals, that at once chew the cud and divide the hoof, comprising chiefly the ox, sheep, goat, and deer species—to such fish as have both fins and scales—and in regard to fowls, though no general rule is given, but only

individuals are mentioned, yet it would appear, that such as feed on grain or grass were allowed. All others, such as birds of prey, feeding on other birds or carrion, or fish, or insects, serpents, and creeping things, fishes without scales or fins, and animals that do not both divide the hoof and chew the cud, were accounted unclean, and expressly forbidden.*

Now, in thinking of what was thus prohibited and allowed in respect to food, we can see, at a glance, that the restrictions could not have been issued for the purpose properly of forming a check upon the gratification of the palate. The articles permitted, include, with very few exceptions, all that the most refined and civilized nations still choose for their food. And whether from a certain natural correspondence between the bodily taste, and the kinds of meat in question, or from these possessing the qualities best adapted for food and nourishment, or perhaps from both together, it is at least manifest, that the restrictions under which the Israelites were here laid, imposed upon them no heavy burden; and that practically they were allowed to eat nearly all that it was desirable or proper for them to consume.†

Some commentators have rested the whole matter upon this ground; and have thought that the prohibition to use other kinds of flesh was sufficiently accounted for, by those allowed being the most easy of digestion, the fullest of nourishment, the best adapted to prevent disease, and promote a healthful state of body. In these respects the kinds permitted were certainly of the highest order; but this is the whole that can be said, as some of those prohibited were not absolutely either distasteful or unhealthy. And it was a proof of the divine wisdom and goodness in this part of the legal arrangements, that the articles appointed for food were among the best which the earth affords. But higher grounds than this must have entered into the distinction; otherwise, the line of demarkation would not have been drawn as between clean and unclean, but rather as between wholesome and unwholesome. That the different species permitted were pronounced clean, this evidently brought them within the territory of religion—defilement, excision, death was the consequence of trespassing the appointed landmarks (Lev. xi. 43, 47.) The law respecting the two classes

* There is very considerable difficulty in making out the precise species of birds interdicted. Several of the modern names given to them are given merely on the authority of the rabbinical writers, which is not greatly to be depended on. There are twenty in all named; and even as given in our English Bibles, they are, with scarcely an exception, such as are in modern times thought unfit as articles of diet.

† The only sort of flesh that seems to form an exception is pork, which is now in common use, and yet was forbidden food to the Israelites. Indeed, it was regarded as so peculiarly forbidden, that it was sometimes put as the representative of whatever is most foul and abominable, (Isa. lxv. 4, lxvi. 3, 17.) But though in common use now, it is still esteemed an inferior sort of butcher-meat, and chiefly consumed by persons in humble life. And the special dislike to it among the Israelites probably arose in part from their connexion with Egypt, where, though once a year every house sacrificed a pig to Osiris, yet the animal itself was accounted unclean, and the swine-herds formed an inferior race, with whom the other tribes would not intermarry, and who were not permitted even to enter the temples of the gods; see Heeren, Afr. ii. p. 148, Wilkinson, i. 239, iii. 34, iv. 46.

is made to rest, in the passage referred to, upon the same footing with all the rites and institutions of Judaism, viz., the holiness of God, demanding a corresponding holiness on the part of his people. So that the outward distinctions could only have been intended to be observed as symbolical of something inward and spiritual. Of what, then, symbolical?

If we look to the Jewish doctors for the answer, we shall certainly find, that they understood by the unclean animals different sorts of people, with whom the Jews were to have no communion, as between brethren—such as the Babylonians, Medes, Persians, Romans, &c. And we can readily perceive how the restrictions in question would, in point of fact, operate to prevent any free and friendly intercourse at meals; for at the table of a heathen, not only might the eye of a Jew be offended by seeing articles served up for food, which his law taught him to regard as abominations, but he would scarcely feel at liberty to taste of others, lest in the preparation the flesh had not been carefully separated from the blood and fat. Practically, there can be no doubt, the distinctions as to clean and unclean, lawful and unlawful in food, did, to a great degree, cut off the Jews from social intercourse in meat and drink from the rest of the world. But if we ask, why the forbidden articles of diet should have represented idolatrous nations, rather than any other sources of defilement within the land of Israel itself? or what fitness there was in the particular things prohibited for food, to stand as images of the persons or things to be shunned in the daily intercourse of life? we shall look in vain for any satisfaction to the Jewish doctors, nor is it possible to find this by treading in their foot-steps.

We must look somewhat deeper; and if we do, the leading principles, at least, of the distinction, will be found intelligible enough, and in perfect accordance with the general spirit of the Mosaic economy. The body requires food; and as in all its relations the body was made to image relations of a higher and more important nature, so, in particular, the manner it was dealt with in respect to food, must be of a kind fitted to represent what concerned the proper sustenance and enjoyment of the soul. The food, therefore, could not be every thing that might come in the way, capable of being turned into an article of diet; for, in a fallen world the soul that would be in health and prosper, must continually exercise itself to a choosing between the evil and the good. Hence, to present a shadow of this in the lower province of the bodily life, there must here also be an evil and a good—a permitted and a forbidden —a class of things to be taken as lawful and proper, and another class to be rejected as abominable. It must also be God's own word, which should regulate the distinction, which should single out and sanctify certain kinds of food from the animal creation (within which alone the distinction could properly be drawn,) for the comfortable support of the body. But in doing this, the word of God did not act capriciously, or without regard to the natural constitution or fitting order of things; and while it prescribed with

an absolute authority what should or should not be eaten, it selected in each department for man's use the highest of its kind—whatever it was best and most agreeable to his nature to partake of. But in choosing out such things, in the sphere of the bodily life, putting on them a stamp of sacredness, that they might be adapted to the use of a consecrated people, and commanding them to look upon all that lay beyond as common and unclean, what was it but to make the things of that lower sphere speak, as a faithful elbow monitor to the higher? to bring perpetually to the remembrance of the covenant people, that they must restrain and regulate the dispositions of their nature, and that, surrounded as they were on every hand with the means and occasions of evil, they must be ever directed by a spiritual taste, formed after the pattern of the law of God? It said—it says still, for though the outward ordinance is gone, its spiritual meaning remains—Child of God, thou must put a bridle in thy mouth, and a rein upon the neck of thy lust; thy path must be chosen with the most careful discrimination, and a holy reserve maintained in thy intercourse, with the objects and beings around thee. For the world has a thousand channels through which to pour in upon thee its pollution, and separate between thy soul and God. Let his word, therefore, in all things be thy directory; make the precepts of his mouth thy choice; and since "evil communications corrupt good manners," set a watch upon thy companionships as well as thy doings—go not in the way of sinners, nor be desirous to eat of their dainties, for righteousness has no part with unrighteousness, and the companion of fools shall be destroyed.

Taking this view of the ordinance, we get at once to the root of the matter, and have no need to search for recondite and fanciful reasons in the scales and fins, or the chewing of the cud, and the dividing of the hoof. Neither do we need to stop at the merely external, and, in part, arbitrary distinction between one nation and another; for we have here a principle which comprehends that and much more within its bosom. We see also how completely the Jews of our Lord's time erred regarding this ordinance, from their low sense and want of spiritual insight. They erred here, as in other things, by resting in the mere outward distinction—as if God cared with what sort of flesh the body was sustained! or as if the holiness he was mainly in quest of depended upon the things which ministered to men's corporeal necessities! Carnal and blind, they knew not that God is a spirit, who, in all his ordinances, deals with men as spiritual beings, and seeks to form them to the love and practice of what is morally good. Christ, therefore, sharply rebuked their folly, and declared, with all plainness, that defilement in the eye of God is a disease and corruption of the heart, and that not the kind of food which enters into the body, but the kind of thoughts and affections which come out of the soul, is what properly renders men clean or unclean. This obviously implied that the outward distinction was from the first appointed only for the sake of the spiritual instruction it was fitted to convey; it implied

further, that the outward, as no longer needed, as now rather tending to mislead, was about to vanish away, that the spiritual and eternal alone might remain; and the vision shortly after unfolded to Peter, with the direction immediately following, to go and open the door of faith to the Gentiles, as in God's sight on a footing with those who had eaten nothing common or unclean, made it manifest to all, that as at first the outward symbol had been established for the sake of the spiritual reality, so again for the sake of that reality, which could now be better secured otherwise, the symbol was finally and for ever abolished.

By looking back upon this ancient ordinance, the follower of Christ may be taught to remember: 1. That he is constantly in danger of contracting spiritual defilement, through the love of improper objects, or entering into unhallowed alliances. 2. That he is therefore bound to exercise himself to watchfulness, and to practise self-denial, apart from which the graces of religion can never grow and flourish in the world. 3. But that still, so far from losing by this restraint and discipline of his nature, he is a gainer in every thing essential to his real happiness and well-being. The Lord withholds nothing that is good; and the enjoyments he does interdict are only such dangerous and hurtful gratifications as never fail to bring with them a painful recompense of evil.

CHAPTER IX.

THE STATED SOLEMNITIES AND FEASTS—THE WEEKLY SABBATH—THE FEAST OF THE PASSOVER—OF PENTECOST—OF TRUMPETS (NEW MOONS)—THE DAY OF ATONEMENT—THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES—THE SABBATICAL YEAR, AND YEAR OF JUBILEE.

THE name of Feasts, which in modern times is generally applied to the sacred seasons and religious meetings of the people of Israel, is far from conveying a correct idea of their nature and design. The most general designation applied to them in Scripture itself is *moadeem* (מועדים,) which properly signifies *assemblies*. And the reason why they were so called is given both at the beginning, and again at the close of the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus, which professedly treats of the sacred festivals; they were so called, because they were the occasions on which assemblies were to be held for religious purposes: "The *moadeem* of Jehovah, on which ye shall call holy convocations, these are the *moadeem*" (v. 2, 4, 37.) In this most general view, therefore, they should rather be called the stated solemnities of the Israelites, or their seasons for social and public worship, than feasts. It is under that aspect principally, that they are considered in the chapter of Leviticus referred to; and hence, the weekly Sabbath there takes precedence

of all, because it was the primeval day of sacred rest, of spiritual employment, and divine blessing, "a Sabbath of sabbatism, a convocation of holiness." This being the primary and leading character of the stated solemnities of the Mosaic religion, the notion is as groundless as it is derogatory to the character of the Mosaic institutions, which has been so zealously espoused and propagated by many divines on the continent, viz., that the Jewish festivals were chiefly of a political and economic character, and that people met together upon them, not for such grave and ungenial work as hearing sermons and taking part in strictly religious exercises, but rather for good cheer, neighbourly intercourse, and purposes of commerce.* It was, no doubt, one of the designs of the greater solemnities, which required the attendance of the people at the sacred tent, that the oneness of the nation might be maintained and cemented together, by statedly congregating in one place, and with one soul taking part in the same religious services. "But that oneness was primarily and chiefly a religious, and not merely a political one; the people were not simply to meet as among themselves, but with Jehovah, and to present themselves before him as one body; the meeting was in its own nature a binding of themselves in fellowship with Jehovah; so that it was not politics and commerce that had here to do, but the soul of the Mosaic dispensation, the foundation of the religious and political existence of Israel, the covenant with Jehovah; to keep the people's consciousness alive to this, to revive, strengthen, and perpetuate it, nothing could be so well adapted as meetings of the kind referred to."†

That there might be time and opportunity for these holy convocations or religious assemblies, there was of necessity connected with all of them a cessation of ordinary labour, a season of sacred rest. Beside the seventh day Sabbath, there were of such seasons connected with the stated solemnities, two days at the feast of the Passover (the first and the last,) one at Pentecost, one at the feast of Trumpets, the day of annual atonement, and two at the feast of Tabernacles (the first and last.) As these days plainly took their character from the weekly Sabbath, the rest belonging to them is undoubtedly to be regarded as of the same nature, and carrying the same import with it. Now the rest of the Sabbath was throughout *sacred* rest, given to be enjoyed, and commanded to be observed by the people, because "Jehovah was He that sanctified them." It must, therefore, have been designed to be not of a negative kind merely, but also positive; not a simple withdrawal from ordinary employment, but this only that employment of another and higher kind might proceed. The resting in such a case must be no carnal repose or idleness, far less any running out of the desire on sensual

* See, for example, Herder, Ebr. Poesie, i. p. 116, Michaelis, Comm. on Laws of Moses, art. 194, who with great redundancy tells us how jovially such seasons were spent, how the time was sported away in social enjoyment, feasting, dancing, marketing, &c., and who can think of no better excuse for modern sermonizing on Sundays, than that the Bible is an old book, and needs some explanation. Also De Wette, Archæologie, § 217.

† Baehr, Symbolik, ii. p. 543.

and worldly enjoyments, but a return of the heart to Him, who is the one great centre of its being, and its only proper resting-place. Hence, all true blessedness has from the first presented itself as an entering into the rest of God. But the cares, the labours, and the comforts of life, however in themselves lawful, or even necessary, all tend to carry the soul out of itself, and away from God. When occupied with these, it has to do with things which are of an inferior nature, and in themselves uncertain and changeable—things which are utterly incapable of bringing it to a state of heavenly repose and satisfaction, but are rather calculated to retain it in a state of *unrest*, because withdrawing its regard from the one absolute and supreme good, and scattering its desires on things comparatively vain and worthless. The holy rest, therefore, enjoined in God's Sabbath, and other times sequestered to a sacred use, was not so much a relief from toil, as a return to God himself, to blessed communion and intercourse with him, as the only centre of created being, and the source of all excellence and bliss.

But for this high end the holy convocations or assemblies were an important and essential means; through these, as one main channel, would the soul seek to attain to its proper rest. Such religious meetings and employments, so far from standing in any sort of antagonism to the true repose of the Sabbath, were most strictly connected with it, and necessary to it; it was just by such meetings and employments promoting the soul's fellowship with God, and interest in his blessing, that the external rest was converted into a Holy Sabbath. Nor is it any thing against this view, that both the weekly Sabbath and the holy-days are spoken of as days of refreshment and delight (Numb. x. 10; Isa. lviii. 13, 14.) For, though they would certainly be quite otherwise, if spent as we suppose, to those whose hearts were alienated from the life of God, yet to the true members of the covenant, who knew how to regard God as their Father, and their portion, the religious exercises of the day would not only consist with, but most materially contribute to their real satisfaction and spiritual comfort. Like David, they would account these among their highest privileges and happiest moments; and would deplore nothing more than their exclusion, by any untoward event in providence, from the fellowship of those who kept holy-day before the Lord. Accordingly, at the first great celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles in the days of Ezra, we are expressly told, "there was very great gladness;" while yet we learn, that from the first day to the last, they read out of the book of the law of God, (Neh. viii. 17, 18.) It is true, we find no prescription in the law, as to the way in which these holy assemblies, either on the weekly Sabbath or at the annual feasts, were to occupy themselves. But neither do we find any express legislation regarding such meetings in New Testament times, while yet nothing can be more certain, than that they were intended to be held, and negligence in attending them is even marked as a piece of disorderly behaviour, (Heb. x. 25.) Under both dispensations alike it was left to the church herself, through her constituted authorities,

to make suitable arrangements for the due celebration in public of divine worship, as also to her members generally for the proper employment of the remaining portions of sacred time, so as to secure the general design of their appointment. That the days of holy rest were actually so kept by the pious members of the covenant is manifest from various incidental allusions occurring in Old Testament Scripture; such as the familiar references made to "the congregations," "the calling of assemblies," "the solemn meetings," and the custom in later times of going even considerable distances to wait on the ministrations of the prophets on Sabbath days and new moons, (2 Kings iv. 23; Isa. i. 13; Ps. lxxiv. 4.) And if we read of no places, like the synagogues of a later age, being appropriated to such meetings, it must be remembered how long it was even in the Christian church before buildings were erected and set apart for worshipping assemblies, how long upper chambers, schools, and other private apartments were used for such purposes. Besides, if we think of the immense numbers of priests and Levites scattered through the land, which might easily have afforded one to every twenty or thirty of the population, capable of attending any meeting for worship, and the character of the religion itself, which admitted of comparatively little of direct instruction, we shall readily perceive that the sacred assemblies held at a distance from the tabernacle must have been of a more conversational character, and consisted more of outward and social exercises of devotion, than can be fitly introduced now into the worship of Christian congregations. But that it was the design of the Lawgiver they should be held, we conceive he has put beyond all reasonable doubt, by making every weekly and extraordinary Sabbath as a day for holy convocations; while the avowed reason and design of appointing such days, clearly inferred the obligation of spending the time generally in such employments and exercises, whether public or private, as were fitted to promote the establishment and growth of holiness.*

* We hold it, therefore, to be an entire error in Baehr to speak of the "weekly Sabbath as simpliciter a day of rest," distinguished from other days merely by the cessation from bodily labour, and the doubling of the daily burnt-offering at the tabernacle, (ii. p. 566, 578.) How such a day could promote, and be one of the most important means of promoting the real sanctification of the people, the learned author has not told us. He leaves the practical bearing of this part of his views, as of most others, a fearful blank; and with all his contendings for a high religious sense, gives no doubtful indications that he would be satisfied with a very low religious practice. It is striking in this connexion, that while he strongly repudiates the low and more broadly marked neological views of George, regarding the Feasts and the Books of Moses, this latter author maintains practically a much higher standard upon the proper observance of the sacred times.—See especially p. 161 and 202 of his work, Die alten Jüd Feste. The right view, as we judge, is defended at considerable length by Meyer, De Temp. Sac. et. Festis, diebus Heb., P. II. c. 9, where also strong arguments are produced, against Vitringa, for holding that even synagogues existed before the captivity; at least, that places for religious meetings were common.—Professor Stuart of Andover, in a work otherwise full of useful matter, on the Old Testament Canon, seems even to make a merit of depreciating the Mosaic institutions as to their fitness for instructing the people and training them to religious habits, p. 66. ss. He says it lies on the face of the whole Jewish history, that before the Babylonish exile, "they had not only no synagogues, but no public, social, devotional worship," that priests and Levites had no charge to instruct the people, and that "there is not a

The weekly Sabbath, besides being set apart as consecrated time, to be occupied as much as possible in holy convocations, spiritual exercises, and domestic instruction, was distinguished by the offering up of two lambs for a burnt-offering, instead of one, with a proportionally increased meat-offering. This farther marked it out as a day which the Lord set apart for himself, and appropriated for honourable and blessed employment.—But we proceed now to what are more properly understood by the name of feasts, and which, as we have seen, were all called *moadeem*, from having one day, if not more, of holy convocations connected with them.

I. *The Feast of the Passover.*—This, in point of order, was the first of all the feasts. It could be held only in the place where the altar and house of God were stationed, and all the males—with such females, of course, as could conveniently accompany them—were ordered to repair thither at the appointed time for its celebration. This time was the month Abib (literally the ear-month, when the corn was in the ear,) the first month in the Jewish calendar, and usually commencing somewhere between the beginning and middle of our April. The actual commencement, as in all the other Jewish months, was determined by the moon. On the tenth day of that month, each head of a household was required to separate a kid or a lamb, commonly the latter, without blemish, and on the fourteenth to kill it toward the evening (literally between the evenings, *i. e.* late in the afternoon, at the very close of the fourteenth day, but as it would be some time before it could be prepared for being eaten, and as the Jewish day terminated with sunset, while the lamb was sacrificed on the fourteenth, the feast on the sacrifice did not take place till the fifteenth.*) The blood was given to the priests to sprinkle upon the altar, which determined it to be a sacrifice; and, indeed, the Lord emphatically calls it in two places *my sacrifice* (Ex. xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25, see Ainsworth, Rivet, in loc., and Hengstenberg, Authen. ii. p. 372.) It was that sacrifice, in consideration of which the Lord saved Israel as a people, and gave them a national existence. The body of the lamb was immediately roasted entire, none of its bones being allowed to be broken, nor its flesh to be boiled; and if any portion should remain uneaten, to prevent it from seeing corruption, or being put to a common use, it was to be consumed with fire.

word in all the Pentateuch of command to the Hebrews to keep the Sabbath by attendance on public worship." What, then, can possibly be meant by its being called a day "for holy convocations?" For what were holy convocations to meet, but for worship? And if God had never given such holy assemblies, how could he again in his anger threaten to take them away? See Hos. ii. 13, and Hengs. Christol. there. Certainly, if Moses delivered so many laws, connected with the worship and service of God, and suspended the very existence of the people on their fidelity in keeping them, while yet he provided no teachers, no stated times of worship, no adequate means of instruction whatever, even though he had forty long years to think of it, he must have had no great measure of human sagacity, to say nothing of divine wisdom. With Professor Stuart's views, we should tremble for our own belief in the divine mission of the Jewish Lawgiver.

* Bib. Cyclopædia, art. Passover, errs in saying that the feast of unleavened bread did not commence till next morning. It began with the eating of the lamb on the preceding evening, when the fifteenth day of the month began.

At the original institution the Israelites were commanded to eat the passover with their loins girt, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand; but this appears to have been enjoined only in consideration of the circumstances in which they were then placed, as ready to take their departure from Egypt, and, like the sprinkling of the blood on the door-posts, seems afterwards to have been discontinued. The only permanent accompaniments of the feast appear to have been the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs, with which the lamb was to be eaten. So strict was the prohibition regarding leaven, that they were ordered to make the most careful search for it in their several dwellings before the slaying of the paschal lamb; so that it might not be killed *upon* leaven, as the expression literally is, in the passage last referred to, that there might be nothing of this about them at the time of the sacrifice. And the prohibition extended throughout the whole of the seven days during which the feast lasted; whence it was so frequently called the feast of unleavened bread. Finally, in addition to the daily offerings for the congregation, there was presented on each of the seven days a goat for a sin-offering, and two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs for a burnt-offering, with meat and drink-offerings.

The feast was, in the first instance, of a commemorative character, being intended to keep in everlasting remembrance the execution of judgment upon Egypt by the slaying of the first-born, and the consequent liberation of Israel from the house of bondage. But why so especially commemorate that event? Because it formed the birth, in a manner, of their existence as a people. It was the stretching out of Jehovah's arm to save them from destruction, and vindicate them to himself as a peculiar treasure above all the nations of the earth. The Lord then did what he afterwards declared by the prophet he had done: "I have formed thee, O Jacob, I have redeemed thee, O Israel; thou art mine." Above all others, then, this event deserved to be embalmed in the hearts of the people, and held in everlasting remembrance.*

But while thus instituted to commemorate the past, the ordinance of the Passover at the same time pointed to the future. It did this partly in common with all other judgments upon the adversary, and deliverances to God's people. For what Bacon said of history in general—"All history is prophecy"—holds with special application to these portions of it. They are the manifestations of God's character in his relation to his covenant-people; and that character being unchangeably the same, he cannot but be inclined substantially to repeat for them in the future what he has done in the past. Hence we find the inspired writers, in the Psalms and elsewhere, when feeling their need of God's interposition in their behalf, constantly throwing themselves back upon what he had formerly done in avenging the enemies of his church, and delivering her from trouble; assured that He who had so acted once, had in that given

* See in regard to the judgment and deliverance themselves at p. 44.

them a sure warrant to look for a like procedure again. But another and still higher element of prophetical import mixed with the singular work of God, which gave rise to the institution of the passover. For the earthly relations then existing, and the operations of God in connexion with them, were framed on purpose to represent and foreshadow corresponding, but immensely superior ones, connected with the work and kingdom of Christ. And as all adverse power, though rising here to its most desperate and malignant working, was destined to be put down by Christ, that the salvation of his church might be finally and for ever accomplished, so the redemption from the land of Egypt, with its ever recurring memorial, necessarily contained the germ and promise of this; the lamb perpetually offered to commemorate the past, spoke to the expecting ear of faith of the Lamb of God, one day to be slain for the yet unatoned sins of the world; and only when it could be said "Christ our passover has been sacrificed for us," and by the sacrifice has secured for us an eternal inheritance of glory, only then did the purpose of God fully develope itself, which lay enfolded as in embryo, in the paschal institution.

This twofold bearing runs also through the subordinate and accompanying arrangements. The lamb had to be prepared for food to those in whose behalf its blood was accepted, that the sacrifice, by which they were ransomed from destruction, might become to them the food of a new and better life.* And for this purpose the lamb must be preserved entire, and roasted, so that it might not be served up to them in a mutilated form, nor that any part of its substance might be wasted by being boiled in water. Itself whole and undivided, it was to be partaken of at one and the same time by entire households, and by an entire community, that all might realize their divine calling to the same life, and the oneness, as well as completeness, of the means by which it was procured and sustained. So also, in the higher things of Christ's work and kingdom, while he gave himself unto death for sinners, and suffered the doom he voluntarily took upon him amid the furious assaults of men and devils, yet a special providence secured that his body, after it had received the stroke of death, should be dealt with as a sacred thing, and be preserved free from mutilation or violence—the sign and token of its preciousness in the sight of the Father, and of the completeness of the redemption it had been given to provide. But this Saviour, even in death whole and undivided, must also be received as such by his people. No more in their experience, than in his own person, can he be divided. He is, in the fulness of his perfected redemption, the one bread of life; and by partaking of this in a simple and confiding faith, thus, but no other-

* It was in this personal eating of the flesh by each household, rather than the killing of the victim, that the people exercised a priestly dignity at the annual celebration of the Passover. At the original celebration, the special priesthood had not yet been appointed, and so each head of a household did the whole. But afterwards, the priests alone could sprinkle the blood, though the households still ate the flesh of the sacrifice. We mention this in qualification of the opinion of Philo, formerly quoted, which erroneously makes the mere killing a priestly act.

wise, do sinners become in him one bread and one body—possessors of his life, and fellow-heirs of his glory, (1 Cor. x. 17; John vi. 53–57.)

The bitter herbs, with which the lamb was to be eaten, may possibly have carried some respect to the affliction and bondage, which the Israelites had endured in Egypt. So most of the Jewish, and many also of the Christian commentators, appear to have understood them. But we should rather regard them as pointing, at least chiefly, to that intermingling of anxiety and grief, amid which the soul enters into the fellowship of the life out of death. The life itself, when fairly rooted and grounded in the soul, is one of serene peace and elevated joy; but as it can only be entered on by the working upon the conscience of a sense of sin, and the crucifixion of nature's feelings and desires, there must be bitter experiences in the way that leads to its possession. The Israelites were made conscious of this in the lower territory of things, on which God dealt with them in Egypt, when at the very time that they were brought to the participation of the grace and life of God, the judgment of Heaven was all around thundering in their ears, and they were obliged to flee in haste and for ever from a land in which they had found many natural delights. And in the higher territory of Christ's everlasting kingdom, the same thing in principle is experienced by all who, through the godly sorrow that worketh repentance unto salvation, take up their cross and follow Jesus.

The putting away of the leaven, that there might be the use only of unleavened bread, may also be regarded as carrying some respect to the circumstances of the people at the first institution of the feast. And on this account it seems to be called "the bread of affliction," (Deut. xvi. 3,) because of the trembling haste and much tribulation amid which their departure was taken from Egypt. But there can be no doubt that it mainly pointed, as already shown in connexion with the meat-offering, to holiness in heart and conduct, which became the ransomed people of the Lord—the uncorrupt sincerity and truth that should appear in all their behaviour. Hence, while the bitter herbs were only to be eaten at the first with the lamb itself, the unleavened bread was to be used through the whole seven days of the feast—through one complete revolution of time, the primary sabbatical circle, as a sign that the religious and moral purity, which it imaged, was to be their abiding and settled character. Even as now, the very end for which Christ died is, that he might redeem to himself a people, who should be zealous of good works, sincere and without offence, filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are to the glory and the praise of God.

The only remaining part of the solemnity was the presentation to the Lord of a sheaf of barley, which took place on the second day of the feast, and was done by waving it before the Lord, accompanied by a burnt-offering, with its meat-offering, (Lev. xxiii. 12,) in acknowledgment of sin, and dedication of the people's persons and lives to God. This religious presentation of the first ripe

grain of the season, was like presenting the whole crop to God, acknowledging it to be his property, and receiving it as under the signature of his hand. It thereby acquired, throughout, a sacred character; for if the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy. The service bore respect to the consecration of the first-born at the original institution of the passover, and was therefore most appropriately connected with this ordinance. Those first-born, as previously noticed, represented the whole people of Israel, and in their personal deliverance and future consecration, all Israel were saved and sanctified to the Lord. So now, when they had reached the inheritance, for which all was done, there was the yearly presentation of the first of their increase to the Lord, in token of all being derived and held of him; and as the eating of the passover was like a perpetual renewal of their birth to the Lord, so the waving of the first sheaf was a sort of perpetual consecration of their substance to his glory. Whence, also, being thus connected with the very existence of the people in their redeemed condition, and with the first of their annual increase, the month on which the Passover was celebrated was fitly made to stand at the commencement of the Jewish calendar. So in the history of the New Testament Church, every thing may be said to date from the work of Christ in the flesh; and in the history of the believer, from his new birth in Christ unto God. Till then he was dead, but henceforth he begins to live in truth. And living in Christ—the whole harvest of a redeemed church springing out of his root, all must be, like him, holiness to the Lord. In soul and body, in their condition here and their destiny hereafter, they must be conformed to his image so that he may be the first-born among many brethren.

II. *The Feast of Weeks, Pentecost.*—This feast was appointed to be held at the distance of seven weeks complete,—a week of weeks,—from the second day of the Passover, when the first ripe barley sheaf was presented, therefore, on the fiftieth day after the former. The males were then again to repair to the house of God. And from the Greek work for fifty being *Pentecoste*, the feast itself in the New Testament, and in later times generally, came to be designated Pentecost. But its Bible name is rather that of Weeks, being determined by the complete cycle of weeks that followed the waving of the barley sheaf at the time of the Passover, and forming the close of that period, which stretched from the one solemnity to the other; whence it was frequently called by the ancient Jews Atzeret, (Josephus, iii. 10, 6, Asartha,) that is, the closing or shutting up.

There are, however, two other names applied to it in the Pentateuch. In Ex. xxiii. 15, it is called "the Feast of Harvest," because it was kept at the close of the whole harvest, wheat as well as barley,—the intervening weeks between it and the Passover, forming the season of harvest. And in the same passage, as again in Numb. xxviii. 26, it is also called, "the feast of the first-fruits," because it was the occasion on which the Israelites were to present to God the first-fruits of their crop, as now actually realized and

laid up for use. This was done by the High Priest waving two loaves in the name of the whole congregation. But, besides this, as they were enjoined to give "the first of all the fruit of the earth to the Lord," to whom it all properly belonged, it was ordered that at this feast they should bring these first-fruits along with them. The precise amount to be rendered of such was not fixed, but was left as a free-will offering to the piety of the offerer, yet was in itself a matter of strict obligation; whence the precept of the wise man: "Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of thine increase." The form of confession and thanksgiving recorded in Deut. xxvi. was commonly used on such occasions.

In later times the feast is understood to have been held for an entire week like the Passover; and is often described as having been originally appointed to be continued for the same period. But no time is specified in Scripture for its continuance, and as a holy solemnity it appears to have been limited to one day, when the same number and kind of offerings were presented, as on each day of the Paschal Feast (Numb. xxviii. 26–30.) But as the people were specially required at this feast to extend their liberality to their poorer brethren, and invite not only their servants, but also the widow, the orphan, the stranger, and the Levite, to share with them in the goodness which the Lord had conferred upon them (Deut. xvi. 10,) it is obvious that a succession of days must have been required for its due celebration.

This feast has been very commonly viewed as, at least, partly intended to commemorate the giving of the law, which certainly took place within a very little of fifty days after the slaying of the Passover—although the time cannot be determined to a day. But not a hint occurs of this in Scripture, nor is any trace to be found of it either in Philo or Josephus. It was maintained by Maimonides and one class of Rabbinical writers, but denied by Abarbanel and another class; and it seems somewhat strange, that the opinion should so readily have found its way into so many Christian authors. The points of ascertained and real moment in connexion with the feast are, (1.) Its reference to the second day of the Passover, when the first barley sheaf was presented—the former being the commencement, the latter the completion of the harvest period. Hence all being now finished, and the year's provision ready to be used, the special offering here was, not of ripe corn, but of loaves, baked as usual with leaven—representing the whole staff of bread. In this case the fermenting property of leaven was not taken into account. And still, the loaves did not come upon the altar, to which the prohibition about leaven strictly referred; they were simply waved before the Lord, and given to the priests. (2.) Then, secondly, there was the reference it bore to the week of weeks—the complete revolution of time, shut in on each hand by a stated solemnity, and thus marked off as a time peculiarly connected with God, a special period of divine working. Why should this season in particular have been so distinguished?

Simply because it was the reaping time of the year. Canaan was in a peculiar sense God's land; the people were guests and sojourners with him upon it; he was bound by the relation in which he stood to them (so long as they continued faithful in their allegiance to him, to provide for their wants, and satisfy them with good things. The harvest was the season more especially for his doing this; it was his peculiar time of working in their behalf, when he crowned the year with his goodness, and laid up, as it were, in his storehouses what was required to furnish them with supplies, till the return of another season. Hence it was fitting that he should be acknowledged both at the beginning and ending of the period—that as the first of the ripening ears of corn, so the first of the baked loaves of bread should be presented to him —and that as guests well cared for, and plentifully furnished with the comforts of life, they should at the close come before the Lord to praise him for his mercies, and give substantial expression to their gratitude, by presenting to his representatives a portion of their increase, and causing the poor and needy to sing for joy.

There are, doubtless, important lessons of instruction here for every age of the Church, in respect even to the lower territory of nature. But looking to the higher things of grace and salvation, which alone form the antitype to the other, there is here also a time of laying up the provision that is needed for our immortal natures, and a time for the actual participation and enjoyment of it. The provision is for the redeemed, who alone have the new life that is capable of using it; and, therefore, the rite that commemorated the typical redemption had to take precedence of any thing belonging to the coming harvest, even of the presentation of its first ripening sheaf. But the work of redemption being finished, and the feast of fat things so long in preparation being ready, then the freest welcome is given to come and be satisfied with the loving-kindness of the Lord. And Christ having suffered and been glorified, what day could be so fitly chosen for the descent of the Holy Ghost as the day of Pentecost? For to what end was the Spirit given? To take of the things of Christ, and show them to Christ's people, that is, to turn the riches of his purchased redemption from being a treasure laid up among the precious things of God, into a treasure received and possessed by his people, so that they might be able to rejoice, and call others to rejoice with them, in the goodness of his house. Now the work of God is finished, henceforth the fruitful experience of it among his people proceeds; and the first fruits of the Spirit having assuredly been given, he can never withdraw his hand till the whole inheritance of blessing is enjoyed.

III. *The Feast of Trumpets and New Moons.*—We couple these together, for, to a certain extent, they were of the same description. Strictly speaking, the New Moons were not feasts, and have no place among the *moadeem* in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus. They were not days of sacred rest, nor of holy convocations. But being the commencement of a new portion of time, they were

so far distinguished from other days, that the same special offerings were presented on them which were presented on the moadeem. (Numb. xxviii. 11–15.) And they were further distinguished by the blowing of trumpets over the burnt-offerings. (Numb. x. 10, lxxxi. 3.) This latter service brought them into a close connexion with the Feast of Trumpets, which *was* a day of rest and holy convocation, and had its peculiar and distinctive characteristic from the blowing of the trumpets, on which account we may suppose the blowing would then be continued longer, and probably also made to give forth a louder sound than on other days. The feast so characterized took place on the first day of the seventh month, which fell somewhere about our October; and though the people were not required to appear at the tent of meeting, yet in token of the importance of the day, an additional series of offerings was presented, beside those appointed for the new moons in general.

There can be no doubt that the shrill, powerful, rousing peal of the trumpet, is commonly represented in Scripture as an image of the voice or word of God. Hence the voice of God, and the voice of the trumpet on Mount Sinai were heard together, (Ex. xix. 5, 18, 19,) first the trumpet-sound as the symbol, then the reality. So also St. John heard the voice of the Lord as that of a trumpet, (Rev. i. 10; iv. 1;) and the sound of the trumpet is once and again spoken of as the harbinger of the Son of Man, when coming in power and great glory, to utter the almighty word which shall quicken the dead to life, and make all things new. (Matth. xxiv. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16.) The sound of the trumpet, then, was the symbol of the majestic, omnipotent voice or word of God. And that the symbol should have been so peculiarly connected with the first day of the seventh month, was to indicate that that month should be distinguished above all the other months of the year, for the manifestations to be given during it of the gracious and wonder-working power of God. Being the *seventh* month—bearing on its name the symbol of the covenant, and of covenant holiness—it was hallowed in its course by solemnities which peculiarly displayed the grace and goodness of God to his covenant people. For not only was its first day consecrated to sacred rest and spiritual employment, but the tenth was the great day of yearly atonement, when the High Priest was permitted to sprinkle the mercy-seat with the blood of sacrifice, and the liveliest exhibition was given which the materials of the earthly sanctuary could afford of the salvation of Christ. And then on the 15th of the same month commenced the Feast of Tabernacles, which was intended to present a striking image of the glory that should follow, as the former of the humiliation and sufferings by which the salvation was accomplished. In perfect accordance with all this, not only is the feast named the Feast of Trumpets, but "a memorial of blowing of trumpets,"—a bringing to remembrance, or putting God, as it were, in mind of the great things by which (symbolically) he was to distinguish the month that was thus introduced; precisely as when they went to war against an enemy that

oppressed them, they were to blow the trumpet, and, it is added, "Ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies," (Numb. x. 9.*)

IV. For *the Day of Atonement* itself, which formed the most distinguishing solemnity of this seventh month, and indeed of the whole Mosaic ritual, we simply refer to Chapter V. of this Part.

V. *The Feast of Tabernacles.*—This had all the marks of a great and solemn feast. The males were to repair for its celebration to the place where God might put his name; it was to be begun and ended by a day of holy convocation, and the last the eighth, an additional day, so that the whole reached a day beyond the feast of unleavened bread. It is sometimes called "the Feast of Ingathering in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labours out of the field," (Ex. xxiii. 16; Deut. xvi. 13;) for it took place immediately before the winter months, and after the labours, not only of the harvest, but also of the vintage and the fruit season generally were passed. The year might, therefore, with an agricultural population like the Israelites, be then considered as tending towards its close; and the comparative leisure of the winter months being before them, they would have ample time for the celebration of the feast. (But this feast, which began on the 15th of the seventh month, being spoken of as falling about the close of the year, is a clear enough proof how little in the mind of the lawgiver, the Feast of Trumpets at the beginning of it had to do with the New Year.)

The more distinctive appellation, however, of this feast was that of Tabernacles, or, as it should rather be, of *booths* (חג הסכות,) because during the continuance of the feast the people were to dwell in booths. A booth is not precisely the same as a tent or tabernacle, though the names are frequently interchanged. It properly means a slight, temporary dwelling, easily run up, and as easily taken down again, a house or shed for a day or two; such as Jacob made for his cattle in the place, which on that account was called Succoth, booth, Gen. xxxiii. 17, and Jonah for himself, which was so slim and insufficient, that he was glad of the foliage of a gourd to cover him. Tents might also be called booths, because of a very imperfect description as dwelling-places, light and moveable, speedily pitched and easily transported, the proper domiciles of a yet unsettled and wandering population. In this respect they form a contrast to solid, fixed, and comfortable houses; as with the Rechabites, whose father commanded them not to build houses, but to dwell in tents; and with the Israelites at large before, as compared with their condition after, they entered the promised land. Hence, we remark in passing, the propriety and force of the apostle's language in the beautiful passage, 2 Cor. v. 1, "We know

* Most commonly by the Jews, and generally also by Christian writers, the Feast of Trumpets is called that of the New Year, viz. of the civil year, as distinguished from the sacred. But Baehr justly remarks, there is nothing in Old Testament Scripture of this twofold year, nor does any record of it exist till after the Babylonish captivity. It is, therefore, quite arbitrary to regard this feast as pointing at all in such a direction.

that if our earthly house of this *tabernacle* were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens"—our present bodily frame-work, a frail, slender, temporary dwelling; what awaits us hereafter, a house in the proper sense, a permanent, settled, eternal habitation.

That the feast was of a commemorative character, admits of no question; for it is expressly given as the reason for the people then dwelling in booths, "that their generations might know, that the Lord made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt," (Lev. xxiii. 43.) In this respect it was designed, in the first instance, to serve what may always be regarded as the immediate end of all commemorative religious institutions, that, namely, of keeping properly alive the remembrance of the historical fact they refer to. In all cases of this nature, it is of course understood, that the fact itself be one of a primary and fundamental character, containing the germ of spiritual ideas vitally important for every age of the church. Such certainly was the character of the period of Israelitish history when the people were made to dwell in tents or booths, after they had left the land of Egypt. It was, in a manner, the connecting link between their house of bondage, on the one hand, and their inheritance of blessing, on the other. Then especially did the Lord come near and reveal himself to them, pitching his own tabernacle in the midst of theirs, communicating to them his law and testimony, and setting up the entire polity which was to continue unimpaired through succeeding ages. Hence, the annual celebration of the feast of tabernacles was like a perpetual renewing of their religious youth; it was keeping in fresh recollection the time of their espousals; and re-enforcing upon their minds the views and feelings proper to that early and formative period of their history.—On this account, we have no doubt it was, that the feast of Tabernacles was the time chosen, every seventh year, for reading the whole law to the people, (Deut. xxxi. 10–13,) and not, as Baehr thinks, because it was the greatest feast, and the one most largely frequented. The law was given them in the wilderness on their way to the land of Canaan, as the law by which all their doings were to be regulated, when they were settled in the land, and on the faithful observance of which their continued possession of it depended. So that nothing could be more appropriate, when commemorating the period, and reviving the thoughts and feelings of their religious youth, than to have the law read in their hearing. But this shows, at the same time, that the feast of Pentecost could not have been intended to commemorate the giving of the law; as in that case, unquestionably, the time of its celebration would rather have been chosen for the purpose.

Even in this point of view, there was a much closer connexion between the wilderness-life, the booth-dwelling portion of Israel's history, than if it had formed the mere passage from Egypt to Canaan. But the same will appear still more, if we look to the bearing it had upon the personal preparation of Israel for the coming

inheritance. It was not simply (according to Baehr's view) the time of God's manifesting his shepherd care and watchfulness toward them, guiding them through great and terrific dangers, and giving them such astonishing proofs of his goodness in the midst of these, as were sufficient to assure them in all time coming of his faithfulness and love. It was this, doubtless; but, at the same time, much more than this. While the whole period was strewed with such tokens of goodness from the hand of God, by which he sought to draw and allure the people to himself; it was also the period emphatically of temptation and trial, by which the Lord sought to winnow and sift their hearts into a state of meetness for the inheritance. Hence the words of Moses, (Deut. viii. 2–5:) "Thou shalt remember all the way by which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldst keep his commandments or not. And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know, that he might make thee know, that man liveth not by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord," &c. This alternating process of want and supply, of great and appalling danger, ever ready to be met by sudden and extraordinary relief, was the grand testing process in their history, by which the latent evil in their bosoms was brought fully to light, that it might be condemned and purged away, and by which they were formed to that humble reliance on God's arm, and single-hearted devotedness to his fear, which alone could prepare them for taking possession of, and permanently occupying the promised land. It proved in the issue too severe for by far the greater portion of the original congregation; or, in other words, the evil in their natures was too deeply rooted to be effectually purged out, even by such well adjusted and skilfully applied means of purification; so that they could not be allowed to enter the promised land. But for those who did enter, and their posterity to latest generations, it was of the greatest moment to have kept perpetually alive upon their minds the peculiar dealing of God during that wilderness-period of their history, in order to their clearly and distinctly realizing the connexion between their continued enjoyment of the land, and the refined and elevated state, the lively faith, the binding love, the firm and devoted purpose, to which the training in the wilderness conducted. They must in this respect be perpetually connecting the present with the past, with the close of every season renewing their religious youth; as it was only by their entering into the spirit of that period, and making its moral results their own, that they had any warrant to look forward to another season of joy and plenty. For this high purpose, therefore, the feast was more especially instituted; and while the fulness of supply and comfort, amid which it was held, as contrasted with their formerly poor and unsettled condition, called them to rejoice, the solemn respect it carried to the desert-life, taught them to rejoice with trembling; reminded them

that their delights were all connected with a state of nearness to God, and fitness for his service and glory; and warned them, that if they forsook the arm of God, or looked to mere fleshly ease and carnal gratifications, they would inevitably forfeit all title to the goodly inheritance they possessed. Hence, also, when this actually came to be the case, when the design of this feast had utterly failed to be accomplished, when Israel "knew not that it was the Lord who gave her corn and wine and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold," he threatened justly to send her again through the rough and sifting process of her youth: "Therefore will I return, and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my wine in the season thereof; I will also cause all her mirth to cease, and I will destroy her vines and her fig-trees; and I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and will speak comfortably unto her; and I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope," &c. (Hos. ii. 8–15; comp. Ex. xx.) Not that the literal scenes were to be enacted over again; but that a like process of humiliation, trial, and improvement had to be undergone, the severe training first, and then the holy, earnest spirit of the past revived, that they might be fitted for being partakers of the goodness of the Lord.

This view of the nature and design of the feast, which we take to be the only scriptural one, sufficiently discovers the fallacy of those representations which would make the celebration of this feast to have been an occasion merely for carnal merriment, dancing, feasting, and revelry. When the people themselves became carnal, it would, no doubt, partake too much of that character; but such was by no means the manner in which God designed it to be kept. They were, indeed, to rejoice over all the goodness and mercy which the Lord had given them to experience; but their joy was still to be the joy of saints, and nothing was to be done or tasted, which might have the effect of weakening the graces of a divine life, or disturbing their fellowship with God.

In regard to the mode of celebrating the feast, beside the dwelling in booths, there was a great peculiarity in the offerings to be presented. The sin-offering was the same as on the other feast days, a single goat; but for the burnt-offering the rams and lambs were double the usual number, two and fourteen instead of one and seven; while in place of the two young bullocks of other days, there were to be in all during the seven days of the feast seventy, and these so divided, that on the last day there were to be seven, eight on the day preceding, and so on, up to thirteen, the number offered on the first day of the feast. The eighth day did not properly belong to the feast; but was rather a solemn winding up of the whole feast-season; the offerings for it, therefore, were much of the usual description. But for those peculiarities in the offerings properly connected with this feast—the double number of one kind, and the constant and regular decrease in another, till they reached the number of seven, we are still without any very satisfactory reason. The greater number may possibly be accounted for by

the occasion of the feast, as intended to mark the grateful sense of the people for the Lord's goodness after having reached not only Canaan, but the close of another year of its plentiful increase in all natural delights. We make no account of its being called in a passage often quoted from Plutarch (Sympos. i. 4, 5,) "the greatest of the Jewish feasts," as also by Philo, Josephus, and most of the Rabbins; for there is no ground in Scripture for making it in itself greater than the Passover, and in vital importance both of them fell below the day of atonement. The other point is more obscure. That some stress was intended to be laid on the whole number 70, ten times seven, the two most sacred and complete numbers, is probable. But the gradual diminution till seven is reached, we confess lies beyond our discernment. The views of the Rabbins are mere conjectures, most of them frivolous and nonsensical. To see in it, with Baehr, a reference to the waning moon, is quite unsatisfactory; nor is it less so to understand it, with the greater part of the older typologists, of the gradual ceasing of animal sacrifice, for there should then have been none on the last day, or at most one, whereas there were still seven—the very symbol of the covenant. We might rather regard it as intending to point to this, as designed to impress upon the people the conviction, that however their blessings might increase, and however many their grateful oblations might be, yet they must still settle and rest in the covenant, as that with which all their privileges and hopes were bound, up. But we can scarcely venture to present this as a satisfactory explanation. We only mention farther, regarding the observance of the feast, that several things were added in later times, and, in particular, the practice of drawing water from the fountain of Siloam, and pouring it on the sacrifice amid shouts of joy, and every manifestation of exuberant delight. On the last day this was done seven times, and on that day, and probably while the people were so engaged, or immediately after, it was that our Lord stood in the temple and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink."

The Israelites in their outward history were a grand type of the real children of God; and, therefore, in this feast, which brought the beginnings and the endings of their history together, we naturally look for a condensed representation of a spiritual life, whether in individuals or in the church at large. We see its antitype first of all, and without its imperfections in the man Christ Jesus—who also was led up, after an obscure and troubled youth, into a literal wilderness to be tempted forty days, a day for a year, that the people might the more readily identify him with the true Israel; and when Satan could find nothing in him, so that he was proved to be fitted for accomplishing the work of God, and casting out the wicked one from his usurped dominion, he came forth to enter on the great conflict of man's and the world's redemption. In this great work, too, the beginning and the end meet together, and are united by a bond of closest intimacy. The sufferings necessarily go before and lay the foundation for the glory. Jesus must per-

sonally triumph over sin and death before he can receive the kingdom from the Father, or be prepared to wield the sceptre of its government, and enjoy with his people the riches of its fulness. And, therefore, even now when he has entered on his glory, to show the bond of connexion between the one and the other, he still presents himself as "the Lamb that was slain," and receives the adorations of his people, as having by his obedience unto death redeemed them from sin, and made them kings and priests unto God.

With a still closer resemblance to the type, because with a greater similarity of condition in the persons respectively concerned, is the spiritual import of the feast to be realized in the case of all genuine believers. And on this account the prophet Zechariah, when speaking of what is to take place after the final overthrow of the church's enemies, represents all her members as going up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles (xiv. 16.) She shall then rejoice in the fulness of her purchased and redeemed inheritance, and have her experiences of heavenly enjoyment heightened and enhanced by the remembrance of the past tribulation and conflict. Now she is passing through the wilderness; it is her period of trial and probation; she must be sifted and prepared for her final destiny by constant alternations of fear and hope, of danger and deliverance, of difficulties and conquests. By these she must be reminded of her own weakness and insufficiency, her proneness to be overcome of evil, and the dependence necessary to be maintained on the word and promises of God; the dross must be gradually purged out, and the carcass of the old man at last thrown off and left to perish in the desert, that with the new man, all purified and refined into a glorious image of God, she may take possession of the heavenly Canaan. Then shall she ever hold with her Divine Head a feast of tabernacles; living and reigning in his kingdom, satisfied with his fulness, even as with marrow and with fatness; and so far from grudging at the trials and difficulties of the way, rather rejoicing the more on account of them, because seeing in them a course of discipline absolutely needed for the enjoyment of Heaven's fulness of life and blessing, and feeling assured that if there had been no wilderness to pass through on earth, there should have been for her no inheritance with God in glory.

VI. *The Sabbatical Year, and Year of Jubilee.*—We can only in conclusion point to these singular institutions, which were of the same nature, though the one was of a higher and more complete character than the other. They were not properly feasts; and yet stood closely related to these, as they formed in the natural and civil province, a kind of Sabbath. The Sabbatical year is hence called "a year of rest to the land," during which it was to "keep a Sabbath to the Lord," (Lev. xxv. 2, 5.) Its cultivated portions were during this year to lie fallow; but the grass and the fruit-trees would of course be available; and whatever productions the earth might yield, all were permitted freely to partake of them, but there was to be no hoarding up or laying in storehouses. Then,

after seven times seven years had run their course, came the year of jubilee, when not only the land should enjoy its rest, but also all the inhabitants of the land should share in its blessings—when every bond should be broken, every alienated possession should be restored to its proper owner, when every practical evil, in short, that had been meanwhile springing up, should be redressed, and a general restitution should take place. The Sabbatical institution in its external and political bearing (for these alone we conceive to be here properly concerned) had, in this, its final issue and consummation; it could ascend no higher, nor accomplish any more. And its highest end and object, we see, was one of recovery from excessive toil, grievance and oppression, a restitution to order and repose, so that the face of nature and the aspect of society might reflect somewhat of the equable, brotherly, and peaceful state of heaven. It was a memorial that Canaan was not the proper home, but only an imperfect type and shadow of it; that every thing there was constantly tending, through human infirmity and corruption, to change and deteriorate what God had settled; and that periodical revolutions were needed to check the progress of evil, and restore the foundations which were so apt to get out of course. The Sabbatical institutions ran too much against the current of human depravity, and drew too largely upon the faith of God's ancient people, to be properly observed. It is, therefore, given as one of the reasons of their being ultimately banished for a period from the land, which they had failed to hold and use as its great Proprietor intended, that "the land might enjoy its Sabbaths." We must refer to others for what grounds of reason or social benefits of a general kind may be advanced in behalf of the institutions, as well as for any discussion of the several points of difficulty connected with their rigid observance. But we cannot stop without pointing to the blessed promise they unfold of that coming time, when, as for the church herself, there shall be a restoration to the glorious image of God, so in the church's inheritance there shall be "the restitution of all things." Sin has meanwhile put them into grievous trouble and confusion; even in the best constituted states, the blessed repose and perfect order of Paradise are seen but in scattered fragments; the powers of evil every where intermingle their working with that of the powers of light; but a day of rest and eternal jubilee is coming, when all disorder shall be rectified, all evil quelled, and sorrow and sighing shall for ever flee away. Then, when the work of God is finished, the inheritance itself shall not less reflect his glory, than the persons of those who have been redeemed to occupy it. (But see former Vol. p. 264–290.

CONCLUSION.

REMARKS ON TYPICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF ISRAEL—ESPECIALLY THE CONQUEST AND POSSESSION OF CANAAN, AND THE INSTITUTION OF THE KINGLY GOVERNMENT.

THE preceding chapters embrace all that can with propriety be regarded as of a symbolical and typical character in the Mosaic institutions. And the discussion of the several topics has necessarily extended over so large a space, that we can now do little more than refer to such transactions, in the history that followed the establishment of the law, as carry a typical bearing on the realities of the gospel. These, however, by no means occupy the same relative importance, that we found to belong to the transactions of that special providence, which God maintained toward his church, during the ages that followed the introduction of the Patriarchal religion. The ideas symbolized in that first and simplest form of religion for fallen man, were comparatively few, and they required to be supplemented and enlarged, as the development of the divine plan proceeded, by a variety of others brought out from time to time in the course of providence. But now, on the contrary, the ideas embodied in the institutions of worship were so varied and comprehensive, that they scarcely admitted of any additions being made to their number by the events of history; and the service to be rendered by the latter, chiefly consisted in giving an exemplification in providence of the great principles of truth and duty, already disclosed in the direct and symbolical instruction of the law of Moses. It is in this light mainly, that the future history of Israel in the land of Canaan, with all its alternations of good and evil, should be regarded—not as intended to introduce or develope any thing properly new, but rather to give the seal of confirmation to what was old. We could not traverse this field, therefore, at any length, without substantially repeating what has been stated at some previous stage of our investigation; and, indeed, a considerable portion of them have already been referred to at their proper places. Some also, in particular, the transactions connected with the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and the redemption from Babylon, we found it necessary to explain and dwell upon in the former Volume, when opening up and establishing the principles of Typological interpretation, (see especially, p. 52–58, 83–85, 119–122,) so that any further discussion of them here is unnecessary.

But there are still two events which stand out so prominently in this portion of sacred history, and which in themselves occupy so peculiar a place, that we cannot conclude this volume without indicating, however briefly, their proper character and typical bearing. These are, the conquest and possession of Canaan, and the institution of the kingly government. Both have also been made the subject of remark in the former volume, and what is now to be stated will be only supplementary.

1. In regard to the first of these events, the conquest and possession of Canaan, a great many objections have been thrown out by infidel and superficial writers, partly from not considering it in the right point of view, and partly from enmity to the principles of the divine government, to which they are as decidedly opposed in their New, as in their Old Testament

form. The right of the Israelites to the land of Canaan stood simply in the free gift and promise of God to their fathers—a gift and a promise made, when Canaan was already possessed by a race of occupants, whose expulsion was from the first contemplated (Gen. xii. 6, xvii. 8; Acts vii. 5, &c.;) so that the idea of Michaelis, that the family of Abraham had an original title to the land by previous occupation, is a mere fiction, which has no countenance in the word of God. Nor could it have been a proper type of the final inheritance, the inheritance of a redeemed and glorious world, without having been first conferred by God in free and sovereign gift, as a land they had no natural title to inherit, and vindicated at last from the hands of possessors, who had abused it to purposes of evil (Former Vol. p. 277–290.)—What God sought in Canaan was an inheritance —a place of rest and blessing to his church—but still only a temporary inheritance, merely a type and pledge of that final rest, which remaineth for the people of God. All must, therefore, be ordered and done concerning the one, so as fitly to represent and image forth the higher and more important things, which belong to the other—that the past and temporary might serve as a mirror, in which to behold the future and abiding, and that the principles of God's dealings toward his church might be seen to be substantially the same, whether displayed on the theatre of temporal, or on that of eternal realities. On this account, partly at least, what was chosen for the inheritance of Israel was emphatically the region of pollution, needing to be redeemed from the hands of its foul possessors, and by signal judgments, executed through the instrumentality of the church, swept from its crying abominations, and garnished for her reception. In this way alone could the things done concerning it shadow forth, and prepare for the possession of the final inheritance of a glorified world—an inheritance, which also needs to be redeemed from the powers of darkness, that meanwhile overlay it with their pollutions, and which must be purged and refined by many a work of judgment, before it can become the meet abode of everlasting bliss. The spirit of Antichrist must first be judged and cast out; Babylon, the mother of abominations, which has made the earth drunk with the wine of her fornications, must come in remembrance before God, and receive in vials of outpoured wrath the due recompense of her sins; so that woes of judgment and executions of vengeance must precede the church's occupation of her purchased inheritance, similar in kind to those, which put Israel in possession of the land of Canaan. Indeed, the scenes presented to our view in the concluding chapters of Revelation, are but an expansion to the affairs of a whole world, and the destinies of a coming eternity, of those which we find depicted in the wars of Joshua. In these awful scenes we see, on the one hand, the Captain of the Lord's host, of whom Joshua was but a servant and imperfect type, and also the host itself of a redeemed and elect church, with the sure word of promise, and the resistless artillery of Heaven on their side; while, on the other hand, we have the doomed enemies of God and the church, long borne with, but now at last delivered to judgment—the wrath falling on them to the uttermost, till "the spiritual wickedness" being bound and cast out of their abused possession, the new heavens and the new earth rise into view, where defilement cannot enter, and righteousness for ever dwells.

We have said, that the work of judgment in the one case, was similar in kind to what shall take place in the other, meaning thereby, that the principle of government, on which both proceed, shall be alike. But we would on no account be understood as affirming, that the judging and extirpating of evil will take the same external and literal war-form, in the latter case,

that it did in the former. Allowance should be made, which, however, is seldom done, for the difference existing between the respective dispensations. No doubt there may, also, and to some extent must be, outward visitations of evil upon the adversaries; but they are not to be expected in the same degree as formerly. Christ's own personal conquest over evil gives what may be called the tone and impress to what were chiefly to follow in his kingdom—a conquest effected not by external violence, but by the exhibition of truth and righteousness, putting to shame the advocates of error and ungodliness. Conquests of this kind should now be regarded as forming the chief and proper counterpart to those of the earlier dispensation; and in so far as the church has to take part in them, her grand weapon must be the sharp two-edged sword of God's word, (Ps. cxlix. 6, 7; Heb. iv. 12.)—We have only to add, in regard to the typical conquest of Canaan, that while all bore a respect to the higher things to come, still nothing was of course done even in respect to the Canaanites, but what is capable on that ground alone of a perfect justification. The Israelites, it is true, had no right to take their land from them, unless the original Proprietor had conferred on them such a right: but this he did, and thus entirely separated the case of Israel from that of ordinary invaders and worldly conquerors. Nor did God deprive the former inhabitants of their possession without having tried many means to turn them from their wickedness; such as, the ministry of Melchizedec, the sojourning among them of Abraham and his family, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah; and he even in great forbearance withheld the execution of vengeance, till their sins had risen to such a height of enormity, that for the cause of order, and purity in the world, summary condemnation was required (compare Gen. xv. 16, and Lev. xxiv.) Also, that the Israelites should themselves be the instruments of executing the judgment written, was fitted to have a most salutary effect upon their minds, and to keep them in perpetual remembrance, if any thing could, of the tenure of holiness, on which they held the land. The very place they occupied thus became to them a great monument of the evil of sin, and the foundations of their own history, a witness against them, that if they should defile the land with pollution, they must inevitably perish.

2. A very few words of explanation must suffice respecting the institution of the kingly government, as we have already treated of it at considerable length, in connexion with the house of David, and the prophecies pointing through that to the future kingdom of Messiah, (Former Vol. p. 105–114.) When the proposal came to be made by the people for this form of government, it is true, the Lord remonstrated against it by the hand of Samuel. But this could only refer to the spirit in which a king was sought, and the purposes the people had in view. For it was among the promises made to Abraham and his immediate descendants, that "kings should come out of them," (Gen. xvii. 6, xxxv. 11.) That there should be a house of royalty within the seed of promise, was again clearly predicted in the last words of Jacob, with the addition of the particular tribe to which the honour should belong: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh come." And that Moses had these intimations of the divine purpose in his mind, is obvious from Deut. xvii. 14–20, which prescribes the rules to be observed by the people in the election of a king, and by the king who might be chosen. Nor can we doubt, that in anticipation of this change taking place, the priesthood was made so exclusively spiritual in its functions, that there might be no interfering between the two lines, in what properly belonged to each. It, there-

fore, formed no contrariety in itself to the dispensation of Moses, that a king should be elected; the only danger was, that the people should proceed in a wrong way to the election, and that the king, when elected, should in a wrong spirit exercise the government. It is to these two points precisely, that the instructions of Moses refer, and the sum of which are: That the people should be careful to appoint only him whom the Lord chose, and that the king on his part should rule only in the name and according to the law of his God, who still was, and must be supreme King in Israel. Samuel at first resisted the proposal, because they were for a king after their own mind, and to make them like the surrounding nations; so that the proposal on their part argued distrust in God, and a spirit of carnal confidence in outward means. Hence also, in seeking for a fit person to hold the office, they paid no regard to the previous intimations of the divine will, which clearly pointed to the tribe of Judah, but fixed their choice on Saul the Benjamite; for that God caused the lot to fall on him simply because their choice was already fixed there, is clear from the words of Samuel: "And on whom is all the desire of Israel? Is it not on thee?" The king so chosen did not, as might have been expected, fulfil the conditions of him, whom God could own as the earthly head over his heritage; and the rejection of Saul, with the trouble and calamities that followed, and the appointment of David to the throne, without any consultation on the part of the people, were all ordered and designed to bring out by painful experience the twofold fact, that the visible king over God's church must be set up by God's own authority, as opposed to the counsel and will of man, and that he must rule merely as God's deputy, in God's name and stead, and in humble conformity to God's law. Even David's house failed to comply with these conditions, and the chain was consequently interrupted and broken for a time, till He should come, in whom no imperfection and no sin should be found.

Keeping these things in mind, we can easily understand why the head of the earthly kingdom should have been called "God's king," while again that king called God "his king," and his throne, "the throne of the Lord, on which he was set to be king for the Lord his God," and the kingdom itself, "the kingdom of the Lord," (Ps. v. 2, xviii. 50; 1 Chron. xxix. 23; 2 Chron. ix. 8, xiii. 8, &c.) This institution was not intended to thrust God out of his place, as the glorious Head of the Theocracy, and set up another in his stead; but only, in the person of one from among themselves, to give God a visible and earthly representation. God thus condescended to take upon him, in a manner, their nature, and delegate his power and authority to one of their bone. He gave them, in short, a glimpse of the incarnation, and unfolded in embryo the great and comforting truth, that, as the future High-priest of his people, so also their eternal King and Lord, should be taken from among the brethren. Hence, from that period, prophecy so much delighted to direct the views and expectations of the church to the glorious personage, at once David's Son and David's Lord, who was to come as King of Zion. And, as in the earthly prototype, so in this the ultimate form of the institution, it is God's throne which the king occupies, and God's kingdom, over which he rules and presides. When Christ speaks of sitting on his Father's throne, (Rev. iii. 21; Eph. i. 20.) it is not, as many in these days with strange oversight of the original institution suppose, as if He held that throne now, and, at another period, would come to occupy his own. He and the Father are one; the kingdom with all its fulness is the Lord's; Christ's office is throughout mediatorial, delegated, vicegerent; and, as in the days of his

humiliation, he did all in his Father's name, and on his Father's account, so also in the same shall he for ever reign and rule. It was his highest glory that he could say, "All that the Father hath is mine:" and to sit on his Father's throne, and wield, in behalf of his redeemed church, the destinies of his Father's kingdom, is but the future development of that glory. Than this, there is nothing further to be attained, nothing higher to be conceived.

THE END.

Bethel Seminary of the East
Denver Seminary Library
Washington DC Extension
1st Bapt Church Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414